# R E P O R T   R E S U M E S

ED 019 534 AC 000 606

BROADCASTERS ABROAD, AN EVALUATIVE STUDY OF AN INTERNATIONAL EXCHANGE PROGRAM. FINAL REPORT ON THE EVALUATION OF THE 1962 BRANDEIS MULTINATIONAL COMMUNICATIONS SPECIALISTS SEMINAR.

BY- KELMAN, HERBERT C. EZEKIEL, RAPHAEL S.
MICHIGAN UNIV., ANN ARBOR

PUB DATE OCT 65

EDRS PRICE MF-$1.00 HC-$9.80 243P.

DESCRIPTORS- *SPECIALISTS, *BROADCAST INDUSTRY, *INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS, *SEMINARS, *PROGRAM EVALUATION, CULTURE CONTACT, FOREIGN COUNTRIES, MOTIVATION, PARTICIPANT CHARACTERISTICS, PARTICIPANT SATISFACTION, BEHAVIOR CHANGE, EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION, EDUCATIONAL RADIO, QUESTIONNAIRES, RESEARCH, STATISTICAL DATA, COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS, BRANDEIS UNIVERSITY,

A SIX WEEK MULTINATIONAL SEMINAR ON THE BROADCAST MEDIA AND EDUCATIONAL BROADCASTING WAS HELD IN 1962 BY BRANDEIS UNIVERSITY. PARTICIPANTS (28 BROADCASTERS FROM 16 COUNTRIES) HAD BEEN CHOSEN ON THREE LEVELS OF EXPERIENCE WITH TELEVISION. INTENSIVE INTERVIEWS, SEMINAR OBSERVATIONS, BEFORE AND AFTER QUESTIONNAIRES FOR PARTICIPANTS AND A COMPARISON GROUP, AND FOLLOWUP INTERVIEWS ABOUT A YEAR LATER WITH THE PARTICIPANTS AND THE CONTROLS, WERE USED TO ASSESS THE EFFECTIVENESS AND IMPACT OF THE SEMINAR AND TO IDENTIFY ITS MAJOR STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES. FINDINGS WERE OBTAINED AND RECOMMENDATIONS MADE RELATING TO (1) PARTICIPANT REACTIONS TO THE PROFESSIONAL, PERSONAL, AND SOCIAL ASPECTS OF THE SEMINAR, (2) THE IMPACT OF THE SEMINAR ON PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES, (3) ATTITUDES TOWARD BROADCASTING, THE AMERICAN BROADCAST INDUSTRY, AND AMERICA IN GENERAL, (4) DIFFERENCES IN EDUCATIONAL MOTIVATION (NARROWLY PROFESSIONAL VERSUS MORE GENERAL) AND SEMINAR IMPACT BETWEEN THOSE SHOWING MUCH OR LITTLE CHANGE (HIGH VERSUS LOW DIFFERENTIATORS) IN THEIR IMAGE OF AMERICA, AND BETWEEN EUROPEAN AND NON EUROPEAN PARTICIPANTS. (THE DOCUMENT INCLUDES A QUESTIONNAIRE AND 36 TABLES.) (LY)

ED019534

DEPARTMENT OF STATE ★ UNITED STATES OF AMERICA ★

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

BUREAU of EDUCATIONAL
and CULTURAL AFFAIRS

POLICY REVIEW AND COORDINATION STAFF

# BROADCASTERS ABROAD: AN EVALUATION STUDY OF AN INTERNATIONAL EXCHANGE PROGRAM

Prepared by
Herbert C. Kelman and Raphael S. Ezekiel

October 1965

# BROADCASTERS ABROAD:
# AN EVALUATION STUDY OF AN INTERNATIONAL EXCHANGE PROGRAM

Final report on the evaluation of the
1962 Brandeis Multi-National Communications Specialists Seminar

Submitted to the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs,
U. S. Department of State

By Herbert C. Kelman and Raphael S. Ezekiel
with the assistance of Rose B. Kelman

The University of Michigan
October, 1965

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

Pages

Acknowledgements ii

Summary of the Report iii to vii

Chapter 1: Introduction 1-1 to 1-5

2: The Seminar 2-1 to 2-11

3: Purpose and Design of the Evaluation Study 3-1 to 3-9

4: Participants' Reactions to the University Phase of the Seminar 4-1 to 4-23

5: Staff Reactions to the University Phase of the Seminar 5-1 to 5-8

6: Participants' Reactions to the Travel Phase 6-1 to 6-14

7: Participants' Reactions to the Seminar as a Whole 7-1 to 7-9

8: Personal Significance of the Sojourn 8-1 to 8-12

9: Participants' Views of America and of American Broadcasting 9-1 to 9-17

10: Comparison of Participant and Control Responses to the Post-Return Interview 10-1 to 10-8

11: Changes in Images of the United States and of the Field of Broadcasting 11-1 to 11-34

12: Comparison of High and Low Differentiators 12-1 to 12-27

13: Comparison of Europeans and Non-Europeans 13-1 to 13-33

14: Conclusion 14-1 to 14-19

Appendix A A-1 to A-6

## Acknowledgements

We would like to express our deep appreciation to Louis G. Cowan, Director of the Communication Research Center at Brandeis University, and to Henry Morgenthau, III, Associate Director of the Center and Director of the Brandeis Multi-National Communications Specialists Seminar, as well as to the Seminar staff. Without their enthusiasm, their openness to new ideas, and their active support, this study would not have been possible.

We are grateful to the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs for their financial support of the study; to Kenneth Cooper, the Bureau's Chief of Research Programs at the time the study was initiated for his personal interest in the project, his encouragement at every stage, and his readiness to facilitate the process; and to James Moss, associate and then successor to Dr. Cooper, for his consistent support and friendship. We are also indebted to the National Institute of Mental Health which is making it possible for us to carry out additional analyses of the data obtained in this study, designed to explore certain interesting theoretical questions that have arisen. This further exploration is taking place under Public Health Service Research Grant MH-07280 to Herbert C. Kelman for a research program on social influence and behavior change.

Many individuals have participated in this research. We would particularly like to thank Victoria Steinitz, who played a central role in the development of research instruments, collection of data, and initial data analysis; Amy and Andrew Billingsley, John M. Darley, and Marvin Hoffman, who participated in the planning and data collection stages of the study; and Reuben Baron, Catherine Hoch, and Allan Levett who took responsibility for the various stages of data analysis. Without Catherine Hoch's devoted attention to administrative and secretarial tasks, neither the study nor this report would have been completed.

Finally, we want to take this opportunity to thank the participants in the Seminar, who gave us many of their free hours and their well-considered thoughts while they were in the United States, and then added to these their personal warmth and hospitality when we came to interview them in their home countries. Special thanks are due to the members of the comparison group, who graciously consented to fill out lengthy questionnaires on two separate occasions, and--after completing these chores--still treated us as friends when we finally met them and interviewed them in person.

## SUMMARY

During the Summer of 1962, a multi-national Seminar for broadcasting specialists was conducted by Brandeis University, under the sponsorship of the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs. The 28 participants from sixteen countries spent six weeks at the university, where they engaged in professional and academic seminars and other professional activities; in travel throughout the United States, visiting broadcasting facilities and other places of interest; and a final two-week period at the university. Built into this Seminar, from the very beginning, was a thorough evaluation study designed to meet two objectives: (1) to assess the effectiveness of the Seminar in achieving its goals, and (2) to identify strengths and weaknesses of the Seminar as a basis for recommendations that might help enhance the effectiveness of similar Seminars in the future.

Four types of data were obtained: (1) intensive interviews with the participants at various points in the course of the Seminar; (2) observations of the Seminar in progress; (3) before- and after-questionnaires administered to the participants and a comparison group; and (4) follow-up interviews with participants and comparison group members about a year after completion of the Seminar.

The report presents detailed findings on (1) the reactions of the participants to the Seminar and its various aspects; (2) the impact of the experience on their attitudes and activities; and (3) differences between various subgroups in their approach to the Seminar and in its impact upon them.

Reactions of Participants. On the basis of an analysis of participants' reactions to the first phase of the Seminar (spent at the university), a series of steps are recommended that might enhance the usefulness of this part of the experience and participants' satisfaction with it.

With regard to professional activities, these recommendations emphasize the importance of (1) organizing the Seminar around specific professional problems that are of direct concern to the participants; (2) providing the participants with an opportunity to make personal contributions to the program, and to bring in relevant experiences from their own countries; and (3) providing them with the opportunity of working and talking with American colleagues, as equal partners on shared professional problems.

The recommendations for academic seminars emphasize the importance of focusing on those aspects of American life that touch on participants' professional concerns; and of providing--insofar as possible--alternative seminars among which participants can choose in line with their special interests.

With regard to personal and social aspects of the Seminar, it is recommended that the daily pattern of activities in which the participants will be engaged should be taken into account in a deliberate way when facilities are arranged and free time is scheduled; and that organized social and recreational activities for the group as a whole be supplemented with other kinds of experiences, including informal social contacts with Americans and visits to American homes.

In similar fashion, an analysis of participants' reactions to the period of travel served as a basis for another series of recommendations.

The recommendations for professional activities emphasize the importance of arranging, for each participant, extended stays at one or more facilities, in the capacity of a temporary staff member or a participant observer, thus allowing him to become actively involved in on-going activities and to study operations in detail. Also, the importance of matching the facilities that a participant visits with the specific activities in which he wants to engage is stressed.

The recommendations for social activities in the field underline the value of arranging private hospitality, with the proviso that invitations be clearly presented to the participant as opportunities available to him rather than obligations. Recommendations for travel arrangements stress the importance of (1) letting the participant choose mode of transportation, type of accommodation, etc., in line with his own preferences; (2) planning the itinerary so that time scheduled in each place can be used to maximum advantage; and (3) anticipating possible difficulties so that they can be adequately prepared for.

Impact on Attitudes and Activities. The impact of the experience on participants' professional activities, on their views of the field of broadcasting, on their attitudes toward American broadcasting, and on their images of America and Americans in general were assessed through analysis of their interviews and questionnaires.

The most striking finding of impact concerns the participants' images of America and American broadcasting, and specifically the degree of complexity and differentiation of these images. The data that are most directly relevant to this point come from a comparison of scores obtained by participants and their controls in a specially devised index of change in degree of differentiation, based on the before- and after-questionnaires. Participants show a significantly greater increase in degree of differentiation. This finding suggests very strongly that the participants in the Seminar did indeed develop more complex and differentiated images of America and of American broadcasting as a result of their American experience. Their responses on the after-questionnaire tend to become more concrete and specific; they evidence an awareness of a greater number of aspects of American society and of differences within it, a better understanding of American institutions in their own terms, and a picture that is generally more detailed and elaborate. It seems reasonable to generalize these findings to other exchange experiences and to conclude that such experiences are indeed capable of producing significant changes on the cognitive dimensions of attitudes toward the host country and some of its institutions.

Questionnaire responses also reveal a change on the evaluative dimension, though not as marked a change as that found on the dimension of differentiation: Participants tend to become more favorable in their views of America and Americans, though they are by no means wholly uncritical. Data from our various sources indicate that some of the central components of participants' images include the diversity and complexity of America, certain of the human qualities of Americans, the importance of socio-economic differences within American society, and the commitment of Americans to democratic values.

Regarding American broadcasting, participants seem to be impressed with the potential for high quality programming in the United States and with some of the products that have been achieved, but they feel that the structure of broadcasting is not set up so as to maximize this potential--in large part because of commercial considerations. The differences in broadcasting structure and the low quality of some of the American products limit, in their view, the applicability of American approaches to their own countries, but some of the creative ideas--particularly in educational and public affairs broadcasting--clearly seem of value to them. On the questionnaires, participants (compared to controls) tend to become somewhat less satisfied with American broadcasting in general, but at the same time they tend to become somewhat more inclined to see American broadcasting as a potential source of specific valuable contributions to their own broadcasting system.

In their own evaluations of the significance that the experience had for them, large proportions of the participants indicate that they gained professional knowledge and insight, relevant to their professional experience at home; that they acquired new knowledge about American broadcasting and about American society--which was, indeed, an important part of the agenda that many participants brought with them; that they derived enjoyment from traveling throughout the United States and interacting with Americans--a part of the experience that is even more highly valued in retrospect; and that their American sojourn produced some change in their perspectives of their own countries and in their orientations toward international exchanges and their involvement in international contacts.

There is some evidence that the experience abroad has enhanced the self-confidence and sense of professional competence of some of the participants. Participants (relative to controls) tend to become somewhat more positive in their orientation toward their own professional future--to develop both a higher level of aspiration and greater confidence that they will achieve this level. They show some signs of having reorganized their views about broadcasting in general; and of having become less certain of the applicability of their own broadcasting procedures to the situations prevailing in other countries. By the same token, they seem to become less certain of the applicability of procedures used in other countries to their own professional situations. Thus, they tend to express greater reservations than controls about the training value of international exchanges for their own broadcasters. They do not reject the value of international exchange; if anything, they become more positive about it. But they seem to have become more realistic about its limitations.

In sum, we can conclude that the present Seminar had a major impact on participants' views of America and American broadcasting--

and one that is likely to be lasting because it involves not merely a change in the favorableness of images held, but a change in their complexity, differentiation, and richness of detail. The Seminar's impact on the participants' professional attitudes and activities was less marked, but there certainly is some evidence of changes in these respects. The Seminar seemed to be least effective in generating an international network of professional communication and exchange, although it produced a stepped-up level of interaction of the participants with American individuals and organizations.

Differences Between Subgroups. Participants who had shown considerable change on the measure that yielded our major finding of impact--the index of change in differentiation of the image of America--were compared with those who showed little change. Our analysis suggests three factors that may, in interaction with each other, account for the increased differentiation manifested by the former group: (1) Their readiness--due to their freedom from cultural and linguistic barriers, their professional self-confidence, and the specificity of their expectations--to enter quickly and easily into searching, give-and-take interactions with the Americans they met, and thus to become exposed to the variety and complexity of Americans and their views; (2) their possession of a fairly well articulated cognitive framework about the United States, which helped them scan new information more quickly and integrate new insight more readily; and (3) their disappointment in the professional experience, which may have caused them to give greater weight to the interest in learning about America that they brought with them, but that might--under other circumstances--have remained more latent. The disappointment may or may not be causally related to the changes manifested by the High Differentiators, but in any event it did not interfere with these changes.

A second subgroup analysis involved comparison between the European and non-European participants. The two groups present two rather distinct patterns in their approaches to the American experience. The European tended to come to the Seminar with a broader and less specific agenda, which included not only professional concerns, but also an interest in seeing the country, in meeting people, and in deepening his understanding of American society. He quickly decided that the Seminar was not set up and the participants were not selected in such a way as to make it a professional exchange at the level he desired, and therefore he readily adopted the role of observer, in relation to both American society and American broadcasting activities. The non-Europeans, by contrast, came with a more limited and specific agenda. He was less interested not only in learning about America in general (except in an incidental, if highly valued part of his experience), but also in observing and hearing about American broadcasting. What he wanted were professional experiences around specific problems that would maximize his directly applicable skills and knowledge. He found professional exchanges useful and wanted more of them; and approached his travel period in a highly task-oriented way.

In line with their different expectations, goals, and ways of relating themselves to their American experience, the Europeans and non-Europeans manifested rather different effects. For the Europeans, the trip had--in line with his expectation--little impact on his professional activities, except that it allowed him to establish professional and personal contacts with American colleagues. The most striking effect of the trip is the increased understanding of American society and differentiation of his image of America with which he comes away--quite in keeping with the agenda that he had set for himself. His attitude toward American broadcasting is also differentiated, but on the whole less positive. The non-European comes away with strong approval of American broadcasting, in rather global terms, which probably reflects the fact that he is less interested in comparing American broadcasting to other approaches as he is in extracting from it things that would be useful in his own situation. The major impact of the experience for him--again, consistent with his particular agenda--was in the professional area. He seems to feel that participation in the Seminar helped, at least in some measure, to enhance his skills, to increase his knowledge of relevant approaches and techniques, to redefine his professional role, and to advance his career.

The observed differences between Europeans and non-Europeans do not apply across the board and cannot be generalized to other situations. The main value of this comparison is that it helps us identify two patterns of reaction to an international exchange experience. Together with our comparison between High and Low Differentiators, it suggests two major general implications: (1) that different individuals, in keeping with their different goals and orientations, need different kinds of experiences if an exchange program is to be satisfying to them and have an impact upon them; and (2) that there is more than one way in which a program can provide satisfaction and have impact, so that the same program can be satisfying and effective for different individuals in different ways, despite differences in their goals and orientations, as long as it offers avenues for meeting their special needs.

# CHAPTER 1

# INTRODUCTION

Since the end of World War II the scope and rate of educational and cultural exchange across national boundaries have shown a marked increase. In particular, there have been large numbers of students, scholars, and specialists in various areas who have gone abroad to obtain special training, or to familiarize themselves with activities in other countries that are relevant to their own fields of interest, or to exchange ideas and experiences with colleagues from other parts of the world.

Professional and educational exchange activities are carried out by a variety of private organizations. These include various professional organizations, whose primary concern is the advancement of their respective fields through developing and improving mechanisms for training, communication, and collaboration. They also include organizations that are concerned with international cooperation and exchange either as ends in themselves, or as means toward the improvement of international relations and the reduction of international tensions.

Exchange activites are also carried out, in the United States as well as in many other countries, under the auspices of various governmental agencies. Such activities may be related--either directly or indirectly--to certain specific foreign policy goals of a government or to its broader foreign policy orientations. For example, a government may foster such activities in the interest of reducing international tensions and creating an amicable climate for international relations. It may be interested in transforming the hostile, suspicious, or indifferent attitudes that other peoples have toward it into favorable ones, or at least to increase their understanding and correct their misconceptions of its policies and its country in general. It may initiate exchange activities in order to assist in the development of other nations, which in turn may be linked to a number of different foreign policy goals. Finally, a government may view participation in international exchange activities, in their own right, as an integral part of the conduct of foreign affairs, consistent with the general increase in the rate of international contact and communication during the past two decades. Whatever the reasons, the United States Government is certainly committed to an extensive program of international exchange. Granting that international exchanges may have a great deal of intrinsic merit and may contribute to various goals of individuals, organizations, and governments, do they have any bearing on fundamental questions of war and peace? Proponents of such activities often argue that theycontribute to creating the conditions for peace by increasing international understanding and improving mutual attitudes. There is no clear-cut evidence that international exchange in fact produces more favorable attitudes. But even if it did, "is it reasonable to suppose that favorable attitudes developed through personal contact can overcome the realities of a conflict of interest? If conflicts between nations are based primarily on incompatible goals rather than on lack of understanding, it is doubtful that increased understanding can contribute greatly to their resolution." (1) Despite these limitations, international cooperation and exchange are likely to contribute, at least indirectly and in the long run, to creating the conditions for peace.

> One can distinguish four types of effects of international cooperation and exchange that may have an impact on the relations between two nations and may reduce the likelihood that conflict between them will take violent forms: (1) an increased openness, among key individuals in each nation, in their attitudes toward the other nation; (2) a reduction in the level of tension between the two nations; (3) an increased commitment to an internationalist ideology; and (4) a development of a network of relationships cutting across national boundaries. . . .
>
> 1. Participants in international exchanges and other forms of cooperation do not universally and necessarily come away from these experiences with wholly favorable attitudes toward the other nation or nations involved. Yet the indications are that such experiences can and usually do produce some very important attitude changes--provided the experiences themselves are personally and professionally satisfying to the participants. These are not necessarily changes in general favorableness toward the host country, but rather changes in the cognitive structure--for example, in the complexity and differentiation--of images of the host country. Such changes are probably more meaningful in the long run than total approval of the country would be. They indicate a greater richness and refinement of images and a greater understanding of the other society in its own terms. Moreover, participants in such activities are likely to develop personal ties to the other country and to certain individuals within it, and thus a sense of personal involvement in its fate. . . . This increased understanding and involvement are not likely to overcome real conflicts of interests that exist between the nations. They are likely, however, to create a greater openness in individuals' attitudes toward the other nation.
>
> If there is a continuing pattern of cooperation and exchange between two nations, involving many individuals who are in leading positions within their own societies, then there should be a greater predisposition within each nation to trust the other nation, to perceive it as nonthreatening, and to be responsive to it. Thus, while it would be naive to assume that a pattern of cooperation and exchange is a sufficient condition for peace between two nations, such a pattern should decrease the likelihood that the nations will resort to violence in resolving their

---

(1) H. C. Kelman, "Social-psychological approaches to the study of international relations: The question of relevance." In H. C. Kelman (Ed.), *International behavior: A social-psychological analysis*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1965. P. 573.

conflicts. If conflicts arise between nations whose citizens have a history of close and friendly contact, there should be less of a tendency to perceive threatening intent in the other and to formulate the issue in black-and-white terms, and a greater readiness to communicate with one another and to seek accommodation.

2. If two nations that are in conflict with each other are, at the same time, involved in exchanges and cooperative ventures, the level of tension that marks their over-all relationship is likely to be reduced. They are more likely to engage in at least some interactions that are free of hostility and mutual threat, and that provide opportunities for communication and for the discovery of common values and interests. Needless to say, these more positive interactions will not cause the basic conflict between the two nations to vanish and will not persuade them to abandon the pursuit of incompatible goals. They can, however, contribute to the creation of an atmosphere in which these basic conflicts can be negotiated more effectively and political settlements can be achieved.

. . . . Positive interactions between two nations in areas outside of those on which their conflict centers, by reducing the level of tension, may help to build up some degree of mutual trust and thus at least make it somewhat more likely that serious negotiations on the issues in conflict will get under way. Moreover, the establishment of cooperative relationships in some domains may help to counteract tendencies toward complete polarization of the conflicting nations and may thus make it easier to find ways of "fractionating" the conflicts between them. . . .

3. International exchanges and cooperative ventures--provided they are intrinsically useful and satisfying--are likely to increase world-mindedness and commitment to an internationalist ideology among the participants. Wide adoption of this type of value framework would seem to be necessary to provide the ideological underpinnings to a peaceful world order. . . . . As the rate of international exchange and cooperation increases, it seems reasonable to suppose that ideological changes in these directions will become more widespread.

Such changes in the belief systems of individuals, in and of themselves, are not likely to produce major changes at the institutional level. . . . . /But/ international exchange and cooperation may contribute to the development and strengthening of international political institutions by increasing the ideological readiness for them among the influential segments of the participating nations, even though the major force toward the development of such institutions is likely to come from functional requirements rather than from an abstract commitment to an internationalist ideology.

4. The most important source of the political

> relevance of international exchange and cooperation . . . . is its contribution to the development of human networks that cut across national boundaries. Participation in such activities, if they are successful, is likely to lead to the establishment of ongoing relationships around common professional concerns among individuals representing different nationalities. These relationships have functional significance for the individuals in the sense that they are directly relevant to their professional interests and the effective performance of their professional roles. Thus, individuals and groups from different countries become committed to international cooperation not as an abstract value, but as a concrete vehicle for carrying out personally important activities and pursuing their immediate and long-range goals. They become involved in a network of interdependent individuals and groups, without reference to national differences, and are likely to develop a sense of loyalty to it. What is crucial here is that this loyalty cut across national lines; it need not be antagonist to or competitive with national loyalty, but simply independent of it.
>
> Insofar as international exchange and cooperation contribute to the development of such cross-cutting loyalties, they help to create the conditions for peace. . . . . The development of networks, based on professional and other interests, that cut across national boundaries can contribute to the stability and integration of the international system. It would do so, not by eliminating conflicts, but by counteracting tendencies toward complete polarization--towards subordinating all relationships to a single basic conflict along national lines. (2)

There are various kinds of social research that can help us assess whether international exchange programs do indeed contribute to the achievement of the specific and long-range goals that have just been outlined, and that can help us delineate the conditions that would maximize the effectiveness of such programs. One type of research that is directly relevant here is evaluation research, involving the systematic study of specific programs and their impact on the participants in them. Such research would allow us not only to conclude whether the program under study achieved the goals of the organizations that sponsored it and the individuals who participated in it, but also to develop recommendations for enhancing the effectiveness of similar programs in the future. Evaluation research, in and of itself, cannot tell us whether international exchange in general or the particular program under study contributes to the long-range goals of creating the conditions for peace, but it can help us check out some of the assumptions on which the presumed long-range effects depend by providing detailed information about the actual nature of the exchange experience. Moreover, insofar as evaluation research can help in enhancing the effectiveness of international exchanges, it is relevant to these long-range goals, since their achievement is predicated on exchange experiences that are successful and personally and professionally satisfying to the participants.

---

(2) H. C. Kelman, ibid., Pp. 573-576.

The present report is based on a detailed evaluation study of a specific exchange program: a multi-national seminar for communications specialists, sponsored by the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs, U. S. Department of State, and conducted at Brandeis University in the summer of 1962. A plan for thorough evaluation was built into the design of this Seminar from the beginning. The conditions for such evaluation research were particularly favorable. First and foremost, initiative for the evaluation came from the directors of the Seminar themselves. Since the Seminar represented a new venture, they were eager to obtain specific information that might contribute to the improvement of future seminars of this sort. They regarded the evaluation as an integral part of the Seminar, at least equal in importance to the program activities themselves. Secondly, the staff of the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs was interested in initiating systematic and intensive research on exchange activities. While strongly committed to the value of international exchange, they wanted to know more about the specific aspects of such experiences that are most valuable and about the possibilities of further improvements in projects they were sponsoring. Thirdly, the special nature of the Brandeis project facilitated evaluation research, since its administration--starting with the selection of participants--was more centralized than is usually the case.

The report focuses on our findings about the reactions of participants to the exchange experience and about the impact that this experience had on them. While our conclusions and recommendations are specific to the seminar being evaluated, we shall try to point to problems that are germane to cultural and educational exchange programs in general. The report should be of interest to individuals involved in the organization and administration of various activities in the field of cross-national education and exchange. At the same time, it should be of interest to many social scientists. Not only does it illustrate one attempt to translate research findings into their concrete policy implications, but it also represents a study of adjustment and attitude change in an inherently interesting situation--that of an extended gathering, in a foreign country, of a multi-national group of specialists.

# CHAPTER 2

# THE SEMINAR

The Seminar on which our study focuses was conducted by the Communication Research Center at Brandeis University in the summer of 1962, under a grant from the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs. The Communication Research Center came into being about a year before the Seminar convened and, prior to the Seminar, it had a permanent staff of four (including the Director and Associate Director). The Seminar represented the Center's first major project.

As originally conceived, the Seminar was designed to deal with the mass media of communication in general, but gradually its primary emphasis was narrowed down to the broadcasting media, and particularly to their use for educational purposes. The plan was to bring to the United States, for a four-month period, specialists in broadcasting and related fields from a number of different countries. The countries were to be selected so that different degress of experience with television would be represented in the Seminar.

## Goals for the Seminar

In order to develop criteria and measures for evaluation of the Seminar (to be described in the next chapter), the research staff had to ascertain the goals that the organizations sponsoring and conducting the Seminar were hoping to achieve. Procedures could then be devised to assess the extent to which these goals were in fact met. Thus, in January of 1962, members of the research staff held a meeting with several members of the Program Research and Evaluation Staff, Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs, in order to learn about their goals and expectations for the Seminar and the impact they hoped it would have on the Seminar participants. In February of 1962 a similar meeting was held with the organizers of the Seminar at the Communication Research Center.

Our discussion with the staff of the sponsoring agency revealed several interrelated goals that they hoped this Seminar would achieve; some of these were specific to the present Seminar, while others applied to the whole range of their activities. With respect to the mass media of communication, our informants expressed the hope that Seminar participants would come away with a greater awareness of the educational possibilities of the media, of the importance of concentrating on quality productions, and of ways of strengthening the media so that they can resist external pressures. They regarded it as essential to communicate to participants from countries in which television was in the initial or planning stage that the United States does not have "the answer," that it would be desirable not to imitate American procedures, but to develop television in their own way, in line with the needs of their own societies. As for the relationship between the United States and the countries represented in the Seminar, the sponsoring agency hoped that Seminar participants would come away with the feeling that communication represents a universal endeavor, in which their countries are associated with the United States, and that the Seminar is the first step in a continuing process of learning from one another. A related goal mentioned was the increase in exchange of materials between the United States and the countries represented in the Seminar. The sponsoring agency also wanted the Seminar participants to become aware of the pluralism that characterizes mass communications in the United States and of the revolution going on in this field. To this end, they hoped the participants would become acquainted with the whole range of broadcasting activities--educational as well as commercial, successes as well as failures--and have the opportunity to make their own comparisons. Similarly, with respect to American society in general, our informants stressed the importance of avoiding a "propaganda" effort, and of exposing Seminar participants to a wide range of experiences. They expressed the hope that participants would come away with a sharper, clearer view of the forces underlying American society, and a better understanding and knowledge of America as a country and people. Such an understanding would not necessarily result in wholly favorable attitudes toward the United States, but it ought to be reflected in the objective quality of subsequent reporting about this country.

The organizers of the Seminar expressed rather similar goals, although they placed somewhat greater emphasis on the potential contributions of the Seminar to the professional advancement of the participants and to the development of the mass media in the participants' own countries. On the first point, they expressed the hope that the Seminar would broaden the participants' background and increase their skills. These skills may relate, for example, to the use of television for educational purposes, or to the training of others, depending on the level of development of television in a given participant's country. On the second point, the organizers of the Seminar expressed the hope that the Seminar would increase participants' sensitivity to the potentials as well as the limitations of the mass media; that it would provide them with a better basis for comparison in judging the quality of mass communications; and that it would help them in working out their own ways of improving the process of communication in their respective countries, particularly as it relates to education and to national development in general. Another goal mentioned by the organizers of the Seminar was that the participants would come away with a more international view of broadcasting, based on the experience of working together on common problems, as well as an interest in continued association with their American counterparts. They expressed the hope that channels of communication opened as a result of the Seminar would also allow American broadcasters to learn about methods and materials developed by their colleagues abroad. Specifically, they mentioned that they would like to obtain various materials (such as tapes or scripts) from the participants to add to the resources of the Communication Research Center. Finally, they shared with the sponsoring agency the hope that participants would acquire a clearer view of American mass media and of American culture and society in general.

The general goals of the sponsors and organizers--which we can presume to be similar to the goals of other exchange programs of this type--can be summarized as follows: (1) to provide the participants with a professionally useful experience, yielding new information, new ideas, and new contacts that can enhance their professional work and their capacity to contribute to the solution of problems in their own countries; (2) to open up channels of communication and exchange between the participants and their colleagues in America and in other countries, which can be continued and developed after they return to their home countries; and (3) to provide the participants with first-hand knowledge of American mass media, as well as of American society and American life in general. With respect to the third goal, both the sponsors and the organizers of this Seminar stressed the importance of giving the participants a complete and objective picture of American mass media and American life, including not only accomplishments, but also problems, difficulties, and shortcomings. The hope was that the participants would leave with a fuller, richer, more detailed, and more differentiated picture of American mass media and American institutions, and that they would gain a more intimate understanding of American society and of the way in which American mass media fit into the general institutional structure and cultural patterns. Ideally, they would become more fully aware of the range of activities and points of view in American broadcasting and American life in general. But this does not mean that they would change their attitudes in the direction of an uncritical acceptance of American patterns and procedures. We would agree that such an outcome is neither a realistic expectation, nor even a desirable goal. Exchange programs can be considered successful if--in addition to meeting the professional needs of the participants and establishing better channels of communication--they help the participants to refine their views of those areas of American society that are of special concern to them.

## Selection of participants

The list of countries from which participants were to be selected was drawn up so as to represent three levels of experience with television: (1) countries with extensive experience in television work, including its use for educational purposes; (2) countries in which television had been introduced recently or was about to be introduced; and (3) countries in which television was in the planning stage. Furthermore, in most of the countries on the list English was either the dominant language or widely spoken among the educated segments of the population.

The criteria for selecting participants within each country called for individuals "on the policy-making and creative level who are engaged in television itself or are in education, radio, government information ministries, or journalism, and are currently preparing themselves for important positions in the field of television in their respective countries." The intention was to select participants who were at the highest possible levels within their own organizations, so that they would be in a good position to implement whatever they learned at the Seminar. Preference was to be given to individuals concerned with the educational side of broadcasting, but this was by no means the exclusive emphasis. Finally, for the participants from non-English-speaking countries, the criteria included an excellent command of English, although several of the individuals finally selected did not quite satisfy this criterion.

A distinctive feature of the Seminar was the procedure for

### Table 2.1

### Countries represented in the Seminar

| Countries | Number of Participants |
|---|---|
| Australia | 1 |
| Japan | 2 |
| Philippines | 2 |
| Thailand | 2 |
| Iran | 1 |
| Israel | 2 |
| Cyprus | 1 |
| Kenya | 2 * |
| Southern Rhodesia | 2 * |
| Nigeria | 3 |
| Ghana | 2 |
| Italy | 1 |
| Yugoslavia | 2 |
| Sweden | 2 |
| United Kingdom | 2 |
| Jamaica | 1 |
| Total | 28 |

---

* One African and one Briton

selecting participants. The director of the Seminar (Associate Director of the Communication Research Center), together with the Chief of the Foreign Specialists Branch of the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs, personally visited most of the countries from which participants were finally selected.(1) In each country, they consulted with leading people in broadcasting, educational, and governmental agencies that had some relevance to the concerns of the Seminar; they interviewed prospective participants, to determine their interest and suitability; and they worked out arrangements with officials of the American Embassy that would facilitate the processing of nominations in keeping with the requirements of the Seminar. On the basis of these various consultations, a procedure for nominating Seminar participants was developed in each country, and a selection panel was set up to take charge of this task. The composition of these panels varied from country to country, but in most cases the nominations were handled completely by nationals of the country in question. They might include, for example, the director of the country's broadcasting system, a representative from the ministry of education or information, and important officials from other relevant agencies, who had the opportunity of discussing the purposes of the Seminar and the criteria for selection with the Seminar's director. In most cases, an official from the American Embassy--usually the Cultural Affairs Officer or Public Affairs Officer--was attached to the panel to provide liaison with the Embassy. The names of nominees selected by each panel, together with biographical information about them, were then submitted to the Communication Research Center and the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs for final approval.

These selection procedures eventuated in a group of 28 participants, coming from sixteen different countries. The countries represented and the number of participants from each can be found in Table 2.1. About a third of the participants were professionally concerned with educational broadcasting, most of them with the production of television or radio programs for the schools. A somewhat smaller number were concerned with broadcasting in the area of news and current events. And, about a third were concerned with the production of a variety of other types of programs, or with administrative and supervisory tasks in the program divisions of their respective broadcasting systems. The distribution of the participants among these different areas of specialization is presented in Table 2.2.

After the selection procedure on a given participant had been completed, he received a formal invitation from the United States Ambassador in his own country. Another formal letter of invitation was sent by the president of the sponsoring university. The director of the Seminar personally wrote to each participant, giving him information about the program. Each participant also received four books on various aspects of American society and culture. Finally, the director of the evaluation study sent a detailed letter to each participant, soliciting his cooperation in the research and enclosing the first questionnaire (to be described in Chapter 3).

---

(1) They visited fifteen countries, of which thirteen sent participants to the Seminar. In addition, the final group included one participant each from three countries that had not been personally visited.

## Table 2.2

## Areas of Specialization of Seminar Participants

| Areas of Specialization | | Number |
|---|---|---|
| Educational (instructional) broadcasting | | 9 |
| Employed by broadcasting system | 6 | |
| Employed by school system | 3 | |
| News broadcasting | | 4 |
| Programs* on current events, documentaries, talks | | 3 |
| Programs*, general | | 10 |
| Primarily concerned with administration | 6 | |
| Primarily concerned with production | 4 | |
| Government | | 2 |
| Ministry of Education | 1** | |
| Ministry of Information | 1*** | |
| Total | | 28 |

* Most of the broadcasting systems represented divide their regular broadcasting activities between two divisions, one concerned with "news," and the other with "programs." The latter includes special features, documentaries, talks, discussions, cultural programs, music, entertainment, and programs addressed to special populations (e.g., women's programs). In this table, current events programs, documentaries, and talks are separated from the rest since, in some of the analyses to be presented later, specialists in these types of programs are grouped together with news specialists, with whom they have much in common.

** This participant is grouped with educational broadcasters in subsequent analyses.

*** This participant is grouped with specialists concerned with administration of general programs in subsequent analyses.

First phase of the Seminar: The stay at the university

Most of the participants arrived in the United States just before the opening of the Seminar on June 9, 1962. They spent the first six weeks of their sojourn at Brandeis University. Three of the participants (all Europeans) were accompanied by their wives from the beginning; a fourth wife arrived about a month later. All participants were housed in dormitory rooms. They were given the option of sharing a room or taking a single room, and about three quarters of the participants chose the latter alternative. Small charges for these rooms were deducted from the $15. per diem allowance that each participant received. The participants took most of their meals at the university cafeteria; payments for these meals were made on the basis of a flat rate per day, deducted from the $15. allowance. The per diem allowance was more than adequate for the period spent at the university, but--as we shall see later--some of the participants found it insufficient for the travel period.

The program of the Seminar during the university phase was divided into two major parts: professional activities and academic activities. A central feature of the professional activities was a series of professional seminars. Four such seminars were scheduled for each of the six weeks the participants spent at the university. During the first week, the seminars were designed to give participants general background information about the structure and function of American mass media, with special emphasis on the role of the broadcasting media within this wider context. During subsequent weeks, the seminars were conducted by invited speakers, most of whom were outstanding specialists in their various fields. The speakers included producers and writers of television and radio programs, administrators of commercial and educational broadcasting systems, specialists on educational broadcasting media from a variety of organizations (within universities, school systems, foundations, governmental and international organizations), and an occasional critic and journalist. The seminars dealt with the operations of educational broadcasting in the United States, with the uses of broadcasting media for various specific instructional purposes (such as the teaching of science or languages), with research on educational television and programmed instruction, and with a variety of activities in the United States in the fields of news and documentaries, cultural and dramatic programs, and entertainment. Typically, a speaker would come for a single day and spend several hours with the participants, starting with a lecture and/or demonstration before lunch and continuing with further discussion after lunch. The speakers usually described their own activities and philosophies that governed them, and presented samples of their work. In two cases, the same topic extended over a two-day period and the seminars were combined with opportunities for detailed observations of the activities under discussion. Both of these two-day sessions dealt with the activities of local organizations in the educational broadcasting field and could thus combine lectures and film showings with visits of facilities, demonstrations, and discussions with various staff members of the organizations.

The two local organizations that participated in the two-day seminars were among a number of local agencies whose facilities the participants were able to visit and part of whose activities they were able to observe. These included educational and commercial television stations; newspaper offices; a communication training program, a center for producing programs in language instruction by television and for training teachers in the use of these programs, and other educational facilities at universities in the area; and a company producing audio-visual equipment. In addition, some field trips outside of the Boston area were arranged, which included a visit to the offices of the New York Times, to the headquarters of a large manufacturer of electronic and television equipment in New Jersey, to an educational television station in Philadelphia, and to a small university radio station in New Hampshire.

In addition to the invited speakers who made presentations at the professional seminars, a number of prominent visitors were brought in to speak to the group and/or participate in informal discussions with them. These additional addresses and discussions were generally held in the evening. Some of these guests were specialists in broadcasting or other areas of communication, and thus rounded out the professional part of the program. Others came from the fields of education, social welfare, race relations, politics, and the arts, and thus contributed to the second major part of the program--the so-called academic activities.

The term "academic activities" was used to refer to activities not directly concerned with communication media, but rather focused on providing general information about American society and American institutions. The major activity in this area consisted of a series of seminars, led by members of the university faculty and covering various aspects of American society. There were four weekly seminars, dealing, respectively, with American courts and civil rights (including discussions of civil liberties and constitutional guarantees); American government and politics (including discussion of the party system and of the relationship between Congress and the presidency); trends in American philosophy (especially social criticism and social thought); and American social structure (with emphasis on race, religion, and social class). The last two of the four seminars met simultaneously, so that participants had to choose between them. While the participants were told that attendance at these seminars was optional, the large majority seemed to feel that it was expected and did attend on a regular basis.

A number of social activities were also planned during the six-weeks period at the university. Participants attended several cultural and entertainment events, including music, art, and film festivals; they visited some places of historical significance; and they were invited to dinners at the homes of university officials and in connection with visits to broadcasting or newspaper facilities. The two main social events arranged for the group were an outing and boat ride on the Fourth of July; and a weekend of private hospitality with families in a small New England town.

Participants' contributions to the Seminar. At the beginning of the Seminar, the participants were asked to prepare descriptions and analyses of the broadcasting structures of their respective countries. These generally turned out to be comprehensive, well-documented reports. These papers were reproduced and distributed among the participants, but they did not serve as bases for group discussion.

There were, of course, opportunities for informal exchange among participants, since they lived together and spent most of their free time with each other. Planned and scheduled occasions for exchange, however, were limited to a series of presentations of samples of their work (in the form of tapes or films) that the participants had brought with them at the request of the organizers of the Seminar. Most of the presentations were film showings; there was less interest in sound materials, some of which, moreover, were in languages not understood by many of the participants.

No detailed arrangements for the presentation of these materials had been made in the program originally prepared for the Seminar. The setting up of a schedule for these presentations was left to a committee of the participants which was formed, with the encouragement of the directors, during the second week of the Seminar. The committee scheduled presentations during whatever open times were available in the program, generally in the late afternoon or early evening. Some of these presentations were displaced, however, by a guest speaker or some other activity that was newly scheduled or had to be rescheduled for one or another reason. Often the presentations came at the end of a full day of seminars and addresses. Moreover, due to the lack of certain technical facilities, it was not possible to show some of the materials or to show them to their best advantage. For these various reasons, the "viewing and listening sessions," as they came to be called, were infrequent and not well attended.

In addition to arranging the schedule of "viewing and listening sessions," the participants' committee also took it upon itself to deal with other matters of common concern to the Seminar and to serve as liaison between the participants and the directorate. Thus, the committee made recommendations, both to the participants and to the directorate, about certain procedural details and about arrangements for the travel period.

Some of the participants were interviewed by representatives of the local press or on local radio stations. In addition, several participants took part, as a group, in a television program in which they discussed their own countries and their experiences in the United States.

## Second phase of the Seminar: Travel through the United States

After six weeks at the university, the participants embarked on a two-months trip throughout the United States. They left together by bus for Tanglewood, Massachusetts, where they attended concerts of the Boston Symphony Orchestra and visited at the home of Mrs. Serge Koussevitzky. From there they went to Hyde Park, New York, where they had lunch with Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt. The bus then took them to New York City, where they broke up and followed their individual itineraries.

Itineraries were personally arranged for each participant to meet his special needs and interests. Each participant met with members of the Seminar administrative staff and volunteer assistants in order to work out his travel plans. Many participants had certain specific ideas about places they wanted to visit, for professional or personal reasons. All of the participants, of course, had ideas about the types of facilities they wanted to see and experiences they wanted to have. The staff, in consultation with educational and broadcasting specialists, attempted to locate sites that would meet these various requirements. Cooperation of the relevant officials in the various organizations was solicited, and letters were sent off introducing the visitor and giving the approximate dates at which he could be expected. In each community, an individual or an agency--such as a State Department reception center, a university international center, or a local hospitality group--was designated as the primary contact for participants who would be visiting there. They were apprised of each visitor's plans and were asked to facilitate his sojourn in their respective communities. Transportation and hotel accommodations were arranged through a private travel agency.

Some participants traveled alone; others traveled in pairs, for all or part of the time. In several cases, the two participants from the same country traveled together for most of the period. Several participants (all European) rented or borrowed automobiles for all or part of the trip. Included among these were three of the participants who traveled with their wives.

Each participant devoted a major portion of his two-month's travel to various professional activities, including visits to broadcasting stations and to other organizations concerned with various aspects of the field of broadcasting or of education. Some participants spent extensive periods of time in a single station, observing in detail or directly participating in its activities. Most participants, however, paid only short visits to a number of different facilities in various parts of the United States. Each trip also included visits to other sites of special interest to the individual participant, and visits of general interest designed to acquaint him with America and American life. Hospitality was organized by local agencies in many of the cities visited. In addition, many of the participants had their own contacts in various places, or established new contacts spontaneously.

Each participant's itinerary included New York City (with visits to the large broadcasting networks), Washington, D. C. (with visits to some major governmental agencies), Los Angeles, and San Francisco. Additional stops varied from individual to individual, but most participants had at least some exposure to communities in the Mid-west and the South.

The participants were able to arrange--and, if necessary, rearrange--their travel plans within a specified travel allowance. In addition, as has already been mentioned, they received a $15. per diem allowance for housing, meals, and miscellaneous expenses.

## Final phase of the Seminar: Return to the university

At the end of their two-months' travel period the participants returned to the university for a final series of seminars and discussions. The total time scheduled for this final phase was two and a half weeks. Several participants had to leave the United States before the beginning of this final phase because of the press of other obligations, but the large majority participated in it for at least part of the time. After the first week, however, participants began to depart on a staggered basis, in keeping with their individual plans, so that the membership of the group shrank from day to day.

For this final phase, the participants stayed at the university guest house, a former country estate in an isolated, wooded area. The participants all had their sleeping accommodations in this building and took their meals there. Meetings and discussions were also all scheduled there, with the exception of a few visits to various broadcasting, educational, and other organizations in the Boston area. In general, the living arrangements made for a more relaxed and informal atmosphere during this final period.

During the first week of this final phase each of the four academic seminars convened for one session, to review its domain in the light of the participants' travel experiences. In addition, several guests from the fields of communication, education, and civil rights came to address the group and participated in informal discussions with them. Scheduled activities were, however, on a considerably reduced basis in comparison to the first six weeks. There was a fair amount of unscheduled time, some of which was spent in informal discussion and evaluation of their experience on the part of the participants. It was largely a period in which participants tried to pull together the information they had gathered and the contacts they had made, and in which they prepared themselves for departure.

During this period, one of the participants from the United Kingdom produced a program, at the request of the local educational television station, entitled "American TV: An outside view." In this program, which appeared on television while the final phase of the Seminar was still in progress, several of the participants discussed their observations and impressions of American television.

During this final phase the director of the Seminar also arranged a meeting with the participants to discuss means of increasing international exchange of programs and staff. Out of this meeting a memorandum was developed, which was then circulated among all participants after they returned to their home countries. This memorandum, which was drawn up by a number of the participants, reviewed some of the difficulties involved in the exchange of programs and made some recommendations to overcome these; recommended possible arrangements for the exchange of personnel, particularly between emerging, inexperienced organizations and highly developed ones; and expressed their appreciation to the directorate of the Seminar for the opportunity it gave them to get to know the United States and each other better and to make personal contacts that they greatly cherished.

# CHAPTER 3

# PURPOSE AND DESIGN OF THE EVALUATION STUDY

The evaluation study was an integral part of the total planning of the Seminar from the very beginning, and the research program developed parallel to the Seminar itself. The research staff maintained close liaison with the organizers of the Seminar and had their full cooperation at every stage of the research effort.

## Purpose of the Evaluation Study

Evaluation study has two major interrelated purposes. One is to obtain evidence of the effectiveness of the Seminar in achieving its goals. These goals, as seen by the sponsors and the organizers of the Seminar, have already been described in Chapter 2.

In order to evaluate the effectiveness of the Seminar in achieving these goals, the present study relies, in part, on the participants' own formulations. One can learn from the participants how useful they found the experience professionally, what effect it has had or is likely to have on their professional activities, and what changes in their views they feel it has produced. This kind of information can be obtained in the course of the Seminar itself, particularly at the end, when the participants have an overview of the whole experience and anticipate returning home. Of special value, in this connection, is information obtained from the participants after they have been back home for some time. At that point, they are likely to have not only a better perspective on their experience, but also to be in a position to evaluate the actual impact of the experience on their professional activities in their customary settings.

The present study does not rely entirely, however, on the participants' own formulations for evaluating the Seminar. It also tries to establish whether participation in the Seminar has, in fact, produced changes in relevant attitudes--specifically, in the participants' conceptions of their professional roles, in their ideas about the functions of broadcasting in their own countries, and in their views of American mass media and other aspects of American society. Our interest with respect to the last point is not in finding whether attitudes have become more favorable, but whether they have changed qualitatively--whether they have become richer and more differentiated.

It should be noted that certain types of information that would be highly germane to an evaluation of impact were not collected in the present study. For example, we did not undertake objective analyses of the participants' professional activities after their return home or of the impact their trip actually had on their respective organizations. Thus--largely because of practical limitations--we did not use various techniques that could have been used in the evaluation of effectiveness, such as content analysis of programs or articles prepared by participants after their return, or interviews with their personal and professional associates, or before- and after-observations of the organizational units within which they carry out their professional activities. Effectiveness in this study is assessed entirely in terms of attitude changes observed in the participants and their own reports on their activities and orientations.

The second purpose of evaluation study is to examine the Seminar itself in order to discover the specific features that were most successful, and those that created problems and difficulties. Such information should be very useful for planning future seminars, and would provide some basis for deciding which features should be maintained or even expanded, and which need improvement. The best source of information for this purpose are the participants themselves, who can evaluate different arrangements and activities in the light of their own expectations and needs. While relevant information can be obtained from the participants retrospectively, it is especially important to find out about their reactions while the Seminar is actually in progress. Events that they are evaluating are still fresh in their minds then, and their reactions are likely to be quite specific and concrete. Reactions obtained while the Seminar is in progress can also be related to our direct observations of the Seminar itself.

In short, the evaluation study was designed to answer two policy questions: (1) Was this Seminar successful in producing the effect that it was intended to produce? (2) What specific arrangements and procedures are likely to enhance the effectiveness of this and similar seminars? An analysis of the relationship between the participants' reactions to different aspects of the Seminar and the effects it has on them should be particularly instructive. The most useful conclusions of an evaluation study are likely to refer not to the over-all successfulness of the program, but to the effects of certain specific procedures and arrangements on certain kinds of participants, given their particular needs and expectations. This kind of information is likely to be of the greatest relevance for future planning, since it can aid in the proper matching of participants and programs. It should provide some basis for the selection of participants who can most benefit from a given program, and for the development of programs that would be most useful to a given kind of participant.

To the extent to which the study allows us to relate the participants' reactions to different aspects of the Seminar to our findings on impact and attitude change, it can also partially overcome one of its inherent limitations. This limitation derives from the fact that the study deals, essentially, with a single case. We can only speculate whether the strengths and weaknesses of the Seminar are unique to the particular situation or can be generalized to other, similar exchange programs. By studying both the program and its impact, however, it is possible to learn something about the conditions under which certain effects are achieved. This kind of information is relevant not only to the evaluation of this particular case, but also to the development of propositions that might apply to exchange programs in general.

## Design of the Evaluation Study

To meet the purposes that have been described, the evaluation study was designed to yield two types of information: (1) information about the participants' role in the Seminar and their reactions to it, obtained while the Seminar was actually in progress; and (2) information about the impact of the Seminar on the participants and the kinds of changes it produced in their attitudes, obtained at various points, but particularly some months after the participants' return to their home countries. The first type of information was obtained through intensive interviews inquiring into the participants' reactions to their experiences while they were taking place, and through some observations of these experiences. The second type of information is based on before- and after-questionnaires and on detailed follow-up interviews, administered to the participants and an appropriate comparison group.

Intensive interviews with the participants during the course of the Seminar. While the Seminar was in progress, each participant was interviewed intensively on four separate occasions. The interviews were conducted by five skilled interviewers, trained either in social work or social psychology. Before each interview, the interviewers met to review the questions and be sure that they were aware of the purpose behind each question and the information it was designed to elicit. The interviews were all structured, but open-ended. That is, the wording of the major questions and the order of their presentation were specified, but respondents replied in their own words and in as much detail as they were willing to provide. Interviewers were encouraged to probe further if an answer was not sufficiently clear, or if the information a question had been designed to elicit was not given in the first response. Furthermore, the interviewers were free to make occasional changes in the wording or order of questions, in the interest of rapport, continuity, or comprehension, and to omit questions that already had been answered in earlier contexts. Interviewers took notes that came as close to a verbatim record as possible; they also noted down their own probes and any changes in wording or order that they had introduced. Each interview lasted between two and six hours, with the modal time approximately three hours.

With very few exceptions, the same interviewer conducted the first, second, and fourth interview with a given participant. For the third interview, however, which was conducted during the travel period, there was a fair amount of switching among interviewers. This was a necessary adjustment to the complexities involved in scheduling interviews at approximately the same time with respondents dispersed over different parts of the country. There was some virtue in this necessity, however, since a different interviewer was sometimes in a better position to obtain fuller information on topics that had already been covered, but only sparsely, in earlier interviews. Interviews with all but one of the participants were conducted in English.

The timing and content of the four interviews were as follows:

(1) The initial interview was conducted within a few days after the participants' arrival at the university. It dealt with their preparation for the trip; their reactions to the selection procedure and to the arrangements for the trip; their expectations regarding the Seminar and its various components, and regarding their own activities and contributions to the Seminar; their

previous contact with America and Americans; and their initial feelings and impressions upon arrival in America.

(2) The second interview was conducted during the fifth week of the sojourn, that is, just as the first phase of the Seminar was drawing to a close. In this interview, participants were asked to give their general evaluations of the Seminar and of the extent to which it met their expectations, was geared to their background and interests, and was conducive to the achievement of their goals. They were then asked to react to the composition of the group and the contributions of their fellow-participants; to various specific aspects of the program--including the academic seminars, the professional seminars, the informal discussions, and the social activities; and to the living arrangements at the university. Questions about their plans for the trip through the United States were also raised. Finally, the interview inquired into the participants' feelings at the moment and into new impressions of American broadcasting and of America in general that they might have gained during the preceding weeks.

(3) The third interview was conducted in the field, during the second month of the travel period. The interview focused on the participants' experiences during their travels and their evaluations of these, and questioned them about the extent to which the trip met their expectations, interests, and needs. This interview went into considerable detail on the participants' impressions of American broadcasting and broadcasters. Moreover, participants were asked about the contacts with Americans that they had during their travels; about their observations regarding differences (regional, religious, ethnic, socio-economic) within the American population and the role that these play in American society; and about the new insights that they had gained into American life.

(4) The fourth interview was conducted within a few days before each participant's departure from the United States. We were unable to obtain this interview from one of the participants because, due to illness, she left unexpectedly toward the end of the travel period. In two cases, the fourth interview was obtained immediately after the third interview because these participants (in line with expectation) had to depart before the formal completion of the Seminar. In the fourth interview, the respondents were asked to evaluate their own experiences and activities from the point of view of what they have accomplished, what they found particularly enjoyable or difficult, and what, in retrospect, they would have liked to have done differently. They were then asked to evaluate the Seminar and to discuss features of it that they would like to see preserved and features that they would like to see changed. Additional questions focused on the participants' expectations for the future, particularly the way their experiences in the United States are likely to enter into their situations back home; on their introspections about changes in their views and perspectives that they have undergone in the course of their sojourn; and on their feelings about leaving and returning home.

Taken together, then, the four interviews provided detailed information on the participants' reactions, feelings, and impressions, at a time when they were still immersed in the experiences they were discussing. For analysis of the interview data, coding categories were developed to capture the content of the responses that actually occurred in the interviews and to provide ratings on some of the dimensions in which we were particularly interested.

Observations of the Seminar in progress. In order to gain some direct impression of the progress of the Seminar, the nature of the activities offerred, the different roles the participants were taking, and the kind of life they were leading, members of the research staff used whatever opportunities for direct observation were available during the university phases of the Seminar. During the first six-week period, most of the scheduled group sessions were observed formally by a trained observer. These observations yielded running accounts of each meeting, ratings on a number of dimensions of group behavior and atmosphere for each meeting, and weekly ratings for each individual on his behavior in the group along a number of dimensions. In addition, both during the first six weeks and during the final two weeks at the university, informal observations were made of group meetings, various other activities, and of the participants' daily life. In order to obtain a fuller picture of the nature of the experiences to which the participants were reacting, we also conducted interviews with Seminar staff members. These interviews yielded information about what the staff was trying to accomplish, what they felt was actually taking place, and how satisfied they were with the outcome.

Before- and after-questionnaires to participants and a comparison group. A special "Questionnaire for Specialists in Broadcasting" was developed for purposes of this study. This questionnaire (which is reproduced in full in Appendix A) included several pre-coded questions (in which respondents selected one of a number of answer-choices). Most of the questions, however, were open-ended, requiring the respondent to reply in his own words. The questionnaire covered four substantive areas:

(1) Views of American broadcasting: questions 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 10. Questions 5 and 6 involved comparison between the functions of television in the United States and the respondent's own country, and are thus also germane to area (3) below. While all of these questions may provide some indirect information about the respondent's views of American institutions in general, this is particularly true for question 10, which concerns an aspect of American mass media that is likely to be quite salient for nationals of other countries.

(2) Views of America and Americans in general: questions 9, 10, 11, 12, and 15. In addition, question 13--while focusing on the respondent's presentation of his own country--is indirectly related to this area, since it concerns the relationship between the respondent's own country and America and taps his views of what Americans ought to know in order to gain a correct picture of his country. Answers to this question may thus provide information about the respondent's image of America and Americans in relation to his own country. Question 14 was intended primarily as a

bridge to question 15 and was not coded. Question 9 was intended in part as a bridge to question 10; it was hoped that it might also yield some information about the respondent's views of American institutions, but since this did not happen, the responses were not coded.

(3) Views of broadcasting in the respondent's own country: Questions 1, 3, 5, 6, and 8.

(4) Views of the respondent's own professional role: Questions 16, 17, 18, 19, and 20.

The questionnaire was administered to the Seminar participants on two occasions: before their arrival in the United States, and approximately nine months to a year after their return to their home countries. The purpose of these two administrations, of course, was to note changes in response over the intervening period--a period which included the four-months Seminar in the United States and a sufficiently long time back home to have given respondents some perspective over their experience in the United States and some opportunity to integrate it into their regular professional lives. Completion of the second questionnaire after a delay of nine or more months gave us some assurance that we would be dealing with relatively stable changes, representative of the longer-term impact of the experience. If the second questionnaire had been administered at the end of the American visit, it might have captured in part the more transitory immediate impact of the experience while the person was still completely caught up in it.

The before-questionnaire was mailed to the participants in the Spring of 1962, shortly after they had been notified of their participation in the Seminar. A detailed letter, explaining the purposes of the study, accompanied the questionnaire. The participants were asked to complete and return the questionnaires before their departure for the United States, and most of them did so. Several participants did not complete the questionnaires until immediately after their arrival in the United States; this tended to happen in cases where the selection process had been delayed, so that the questionnaire was relatively late in reaching the participant.

The after-questionnaires were mailed to the participants in the Spring of 1963. The covering letter to each participant also explained that a member of the research team would be coming to interview him during the summer,and asked him to have the questionnaire completed by that time. Several questionnaires were not ready by the time of the interview, and were returned by mail in the Fall of 1963. All participants, however, completed both the before- and the after-questionnaires.

The interpretation of changes from the before- to the after-questionnaire would remain highly ambiguous in the absence of a comparison group. While it is true that the visit to America intervened between the two questionnaire administrations, one cannot at all be certain that this visit accounts for whatever changes might be observed. Attitude changes might be due to other intervening events which have little or nothing to do with the American trip: for example, changes in the individual's professional activities, or in the field of broadcasting in his country, or in the world situation. Even his image of America might undergo changes in the course of a year that are based on new information on America, quite independent of his trip. This is particularly true for broadcasters who are likely to be exposed to much new information in the course of their regular activities. In order to control for these alternative possibilities, it was necessary to select a comparison group of individuals who are as similar as possible to the participants, but who did not take part in the Seminar. The members of the comparison group completed the same two questionnaires as the participants, in 1962 and 1963. By comparing the participants' responses to those of the comparison group, we can identify those changes in the participants that can be ascribed to their American experience. There should be no systematic differences between the two groups in changes due to extraneous events (i.e., events extraneous to the Seminar). If there are any differences between the groups, we can conclude that they are due to the one systematic factor that distinguishes between them--participation versus non-participation in the Seminar under study.

The selection of an appropriate comparison group in this type of situation is an extremely difficult task. Ideally, from the point of view of research design, one would ask each participating country to nominate twice the number of candidates that can actually be invited. One would then select, on a random basis, half of the candidates for participation in the Seminar, and half for the comparison group. For practical reasons, however, such a procedure is usually impossible. In the present study, this procedure was approximated for about half of the participating countries. In those countries, alternate participants were nominated, who--for one reason or another--were not the first choices for participation, but who met all the qualifications necessary for participation. These alternates were then asked to become members of the comparison group. In about half of the countries, however, no alternates were nominated. In those cases, we invited broadcasters from each country involved, who were known to the director of the Seminar and whom he considered to meet all the criteria for participation, to become members of the comparison group.

The first questionnaire was sent out in the Spring of 1962 to forty-six broadcasters in the sixteen participating countries, who were not coming to the Seminar, with a covering letter explaining the purpose of the study and the need for a comparison group. Questionnaires were returned by twenty-three of these individuals. In the Spring of 1963, the second questionnaire was mailed to the comparison group. As in the case of the participants, the covering letter explained that a member of the research team would be coming to interview the respondent and asked him to have his questionnaire ready at that time. All comparison-group members completed the second questionnaire. Two members of the comparison group, however, had themselves visited the United States in the period intervening between the two questionnaires, and therefore had to be omitted from the group. This left, thus, a comparison group numbering twenty-one. In other words, for seven of the participants we did not have a matching control.

This procedure for selecting comparison-group members did not yield anything resembling a "pure" control group. Like the participants, the members of the comparison group are almost all in the field of broadcasting. In some cases, the match between a particular participant and his control is very good: they are both in the same type of position, doing similar work, at approximately the same level. Sometimes the match is "too good" in a sense: participant and control are both working in the same office, the one serving as deputy to the other. Here a special problem arises, in that the participant may have communicated much of his experience in America to the control and thereby influenced the latter's attitudes; thus, if we find no difference between the two it may be not because the Seminar had no impact on either of them, but because it had an impact on both! In yet other cases, the match between participant and control is rather poor: they are both broadcasters from the same country, but one may be a producer of instructional broadcasts, the other a manager of a commercial station. Here, of course, the question of comparability arises. On the whole, one certainly could not claim that the comparison group and the participant group represent either randomly selected or precisely matched samples. What can be said, however, is that the comparison group consists of individuals all of whom could have been participants--i.e., all of them fully met the qualifications for participation in the Seminar--but who in fact were not participants. On this crucial dimension, then, the two groups are clearly comparable.

Follow-up interviews with participants and the comparison group. In the late Spring and Summer of 1963, intensive personal interviews were conducted with the participants and the members of the comparison group. These interviews took place in the respondents' home countries, and were carried out by three of the five original interviewers. The interviewing style and the form of the questions were similar to those employed in the earlier interviews. The post-return interviews with Seminar participants were also similar in length to the earlier interviews; the interviews with controls were somewhat shorter.

Post-return interviews were obtained from all twenty-eight of the Seminar participants. Of the twenty-one members of the comparison group, four were out of the country at the time the interviewer arrived. It was thus possible to obtain only seventeen of the twenty-one interviews (although all twenty-one comparison group members completed the after-questionnaire). This left us with eleven participants for whom we did not have a matching control ready to be interviewed. In ten of these eleven cases, however, we were able to locate a matching control on the scene--that is, a broadcaster from the same community, with a position and background similar to that of the Seminar participant, who was willing to be interviewed. Thus, for purposes of comparing responses of the post-return interview, we have matching controls for twenty-seven of the participants; for seventeen of these controls we also have before- and after-questionnaires, while for the other ten we have the interviews only.(1) In addition, of course, there are four controls for whom we have questionnaire data only.

---

(1) We would have been able to obtain our complement of matching controls were it not for one unforeseen circumstance. One

The post-return interviews explored further some of the areas covered in the questionnaires. They focus, in particular, on changes in the respondents' professional roles and activities, on their views about changes and needed changes in the field of broadcasting in their own countries, on their involvement in and plans for international exchanges and their views of the value of such exchanges, on their impressions of American society, and on their perception of changes in their images of their own countries and in their plans for the future. Thus, it was possible to see whether participants reported any significant changes in their activities, ideas, and plans after their return to their home countries. By conducting interviews with a comparison group at the same time, it was possible to determine whether any changes observed in the participants can legitimately be attributed to their participation in the Seminar. In addition, the interviews with the participants themselves specifically inquired into their own perceptions of the impact that participation in the Seminar had had on their activities, ideas, and plans. They were also asked to discuss in retrospect the usefulness of the Seminar and of its various specific features.

---

(1) cont'd:
of the members of the original comparison group was to be out of his country at the time the interviewer was scheduled to arrive there. He therefore made arrangements to meet with the interviewer in another country at a later time. In the last minute, however, he was forced to change his plans and could not meet with the interviewer. At that point, of course, it was too late to locate a substitute control of the same nationality, since the interviewer had already passed through the country in question. Hence we are left with matching controls on the post-return interview for only 27 of the 28 cases. We did, however, conduct an extra control interview in one of countries, so that we actually have a total of 28 control interviews, of which 27 are matched by nationality. In Chapter 10, which reports the relevant data, all 28 control interviews are used as a matter of convenience, since we are thus enabled to compare groups of equal size.

# CHAPTER 4

# PARTICIPANTS' REACTIONS TO THE UNIVERSITY PHASE OF THE SEMINAR

In this chapter we shall examine the participants' reactions to the first phase of the Seminar. The data to be presented are based almost entirely on the second interview, conducted during the fifth week of the Seminar -- that is, just as the sojourn at the university was drawing to a close -- although we shall, on occasion, draw on data from earlier or later interviews.

The primary purpose of this analysis is to identify -- on the basis of the participants' reactions -- some of the problems and successful features of the Seminar. The analysis will emphasize criticisms raised by the participants. Even when such criticisms represent only minority points of view, they may give some insight into problems that can be avoided and improvements that can be introduced. Of course, features of the Seminar that are criticized by some participants may be highly valued by others. In such a case, however, it is important to know which participants make the criticisms and for what reasons. This kind of information can be extremely useful in the proper matching of participants and programs.

One cannot infer, from the mere presence of criticisms, that a participant was generally dissatisfied with the Seminar. While statements of satisfaction are always difficult to interpret, indications are that most participants in the Seminar were generally very satisfied, even though they may have made specific criticisms and suggestions for improvement. In particular, it must be kept in mind that the participants viewed the Seminar as a pilot project and the evaluation as an attempt to find ways of improving future projects. They were, therefore, predisposed to offer criticisms.

When asked to give an over-all evaluation of the initial portion of the Seminar, 7 participants expressed themselves as very satisfied, 15 as quite satisfied, 4 as somewhat satisfied, and 2 as not too satisfied. We also asked participants to estimate the proportion of the program that was directly relevant to their interests, and the proportion that was at least indirectly relevant. Eleven participants indicated that at least 75% of the program was directly relevant, and 15 found 75% or more at least indirectly relevant. Those who found at least half of the program directly relevant numbered 24. On the whole, it would seem that the level of satisfaction was rather high: the large majority of participants was at least "quite satisfied" and found something of direct relevance to their interests in at least half of the program.

Before we examine participants' reactions to specific aspects of the experience, it would be useful to highlight those features of the university phase that they were especially prone to pick out for praise or criticism. To this end, we examined those portions of the interview in which respondents spontaneously brought up features of the Seminar that they liked or disliked, that they considered successes or failures, that were sources of satisfaction or of dissatisfaction and disappointment. We find that the following features were spontaneously brought up in highly positive terms (as especially well-planned, as especially valuable or enjoyable, or as surpassing expectations):

(1) The opportunity to listen to some of the professional speakers (mentioned by 13 respondents) and to learn about American broadcasting (16); the high quality of the speakers (8).

(2) The visits to mass media facilities (14).

(3) The academic seminars (16).

(4) The week-end visit with an American family in New Hampshire.(21).

The following features were spontaneously brought up in critical terms (as especially poorly planned, inconvenient, or disappointing):

(1) The relative lack of depth in the professional part of the Seminar (9).

(2) The heterogeneity of group composition (8).

(3) The tendency to overschedule activities, thus limiting opportunities for absorbing materials and for recreation (16).

(4) The inefficient handling of certain administrative details, usually of a minor nature (13).

(5) The geographical isolation of the university, coupled with inadequate provision of transportation (21).

(6) The inadequate provision for entertainment, for leisure time activities (8).

These points should be kept in mind as we proceed to review participants' reactions to specific parts of the experience, for these are the points spontaneously singled out for praise or criticism by at least a quarter of the participants. They do not cover all the points that will be discussed in the sections that follow, some of which emerged only in response to direct questions and some of which were raised only by a small subgroup of the participants. Some of the most interesting points, in fact, are not in the above lists. We consider it important, nonetheless, to discuss them, but let the above lists serve as background for this discussion.

## Professional Activities

Professional seminars. In Chapter 2, we described the professional seminars which consisted mainly of talks and demonstrations by invited speakers and which served as the major focus for the professional activities arranged for the participants. The participants were generally impressed with the level of the invited speakers (as we have already seen) and were pleased with the information presented to them. Ten of the participants spontaneously praised the professional seminars for the high quality of the speakers. There were no indications that the participants objected to the idea of having experts brought in, and of being exposed to lectures, given information, and so on. Many participants apparently found this consistent with their view of themselves as "learners." Even those participants, however, who did not view themselves primarily as learners -- those, for example, who came from countries with a highly developed television system -- seemed content that the seminars were essentially set up to convey information to them, and pleased that outstanding individuals were brought in to discuss their own work and present demonstrations. Thirteen participants appreciated the opportunity to learn about the patterns of mass communication in America. Fourteen specifically praised the seminars for the amount of information that was presented which, they felt, would help them in their own work by giving them new program or production ideas.

While most of the participants were satisfied with the general structure of the professional seminars and with the definition of their own roles within these seminars, there were some criticisms of the focus of the individual seminars and the way in which they were organized into a total program. The participants appreciated the visiting speakers, but there was also some feeling that there were too many of them, with not enough time for each, and not enough continuity between them. Several participants criticized the professional seminars for their repetitiveness -- the fact that there were too many speakers or too much overlap between speakers. Thus, one participant indicated that he found most of the professional seminars stimulating,

> . . . but some did go over the same ground. The individuals were generally good, but there were just too many of them. One was subject to sit for an hour and a half to listen to the same speech but from a different personality.

Another participant said, in this connection:

> I think the planning was well done. The documentation was adequate, but the things included in the courses were a bit too much. We could have done with less of the talks. There was lots of repetition. Repetition, I know, has advantages of stamping impressions on one's mind, but if that mind is already fatigued, then it will be annoyed, rather than helped.

What a given participant considers repetitive depends on his particular interests. Thus, a participant whose own work was in the area of news broadcasting told us:

> I was impressed with the number and variety of speakers and lecturers, although I thought there was a duplication of some of the . . . educational television programs. As soon as it had been established what educational television was, one almost anticipated everything else. I personally don't think that the instructional programs provide much material for discussion.

Four of the participants criticized the seminars for a lack of depth and an excess of generalities, in response to specific questions about the professional seminars. We have already seen, however, that

9 individuals spontaneously expressed disappointment in the relative lack of depth of these seminars. Continuity was also a problem, which one participant saw as directly related to the large number of invited speakers:

> I think we had too many people; eighty percent of the material for the seminars came from visiting speakers. It is hard to get a coherent system of knowledge or ideas from such a jumble of presentations.

In short, the gist of these criticisms seems to be that the organization of the professional seminars--in terms of a long series of relatively independent presentations by outside speakers--while inherently interesting, made it a more superficial and less integrated kind of learning experience. Since most speakers had only a limited amount of time and did not know in detail the content of previous sessions, they tended to start out with general statements about the background and context of their work, and then to proceed with a description and a presentation of samples of their own activities. The introductory statements thus tended to be somewhat repetitive because of their general nature. A number of participants preferred more detailed discussions of more limited areas, focusing on specific issues and concrete problems. Moreover, there was only limited opportunity for the different presentations to build on each other, and some participants felt that the information gathered from these discrete presentations did not add up to an organized framework. There was no deliberate attempt to tie the material together, to point up relationships, and to provide integration. It should be noted that the limitations of the professional seminars in terms of the depth of learning that they made possible were by no means of universal concern to the participants. Some participants, apparently, were pleased with the opportunity of meeting a range of figures in American broadcasting, observing their personalities, and comparing their approaches and their stands on general issues in the field. Those participants, however, whose primary focus was on matters of content found this particular way of organizing the professional seminars somewhat disappointing.

Participants' reactions to the professional seminars on the depth dimension depend, to a very large extent, on their particular professional interests. Thus, participants who work in the area of instructional broadcasting, may ask for more specificity and detail for those seminars that deal with instructional television, but may consider other seminars unduly repetitive. On the other hand, participants who work in news broadcasting may consider seminars dealing with instructional television needlessly detailed and time-consuming. In short, participants seem to like detailed and specific seminars in their own specialties, but prefer general ones outside of their own field, where all they want is a brief exposure to what is going on. By the same token, participants would prefer fewer seminars in areas outside of their specialty and are more likely to find these repetitive. While they might also prefer a smaller number of speakers in their own area, in order to allow for more detail and depth, they are considerably less likely to find these repetitive. They are more likely to be attuned to the differences in the presentations of speakers in their own area and to be interested in nuances that escape the non-specialist.

The question of relevance to the participants' professional interests leads us to a final, but possibly central criticism of the professional seminars. The organization of the professional seminars, in terms of a series of invited speakers, limited the possibilities of a problem-centered approach. Each speaker came for only a relatively brief period. There was little opportunity for the participants to take up the issues raised by the speaker, to bring in their own relevant experiences, and to focus on specific problems that were of professional concern to them. The absence of an organizing framework for the professional seminars and the limited continuity between them, again, precluded an orientation toward specific common problems. The participants had a good opportunity to learn about the range of activities in American broadcasting, but little opportunity to relate this information to their own situations and to delve into its implications for matters of common concern.

This point of view was expressed by seven of the participants, who criticized the professional seminars for offering insufficient opportunity to discuss the participants' own problems and situations, and for their over-emphasis on American broadcasting. Thus, one participant said:

> Even during the discussion periods we did not talk much about our own work. We listened mostly to the American experts. People asked questions, but they were mostly about American programs.

Another participant made a related point, when he said that the seminars are not organized in such a way as "to let the participants contribute. You just question the speaker and get an answer." Finally, a third participant can be cited in this connection. He told the interviewer:

> I didn't expect the professional seminars to be a regular classroom . . . . I thought we would sit in a room and discuss problems of one country or another.

Exchange Among Participants. We mentioned, in Chapter 2, that planned and scheduled occasions for exchange among participants were limited to a series of presentations of samples of their work that the participants had brought with them. At the time of the interview, about half of the participants had presented such a program or were still planning to do so.

A number of participants seemed to feel that these presentations did not have an important enough place in the over-all program of the Seminar and that they were not arranged in such a way as to be of maximum benefit to the participants. They represented a peripheral activity, not fully integrated into the rest of the professional program. As a result, there was less interest in these activities and attendance was low. One participant remarked, for example:

> We had already watched so much other material, and our material was not related to that, so that they were not worked

> into a whole presentation. This was felt to be a burden to some people, so the attendance was small.

The peripheral status of these presentations is illustrated in another participant's answer to the question: "Did you present any special program to the group?"

> We had one on tap the other night, but due to some misconception or bad communication, no one came to view it. We have been trying to get another program on, but we haven't been able to yet.

Another participant, whose work is in the field of radio, told us in response to the same question:

> Yesterday I was to present one, but the people failed to come . . . so we cancelled the program. It was to be the first sound program. All the others were television programs and school broadcasting.

Some participants mentioned practical difficulties that interfered with the showing of programs they had brought, or with the optimal integration between the showing of a film and discussion of it. The major obstacle (mentioned by five participants) was the lack of the necessary technical facilities for showing certain programs. They may have been particularly concerned about such difficulties because these presentations represented the only structured opportunities for discussing their own work built into the program.

It seems clear from various comments made by participants that they would have wanted the presentations of their own work to be upgraded. Several mentioned that the presentations should have been more fully integrated into the over-all program, and given a better place within it. Moreover, a number of participants indicated that they were not interested in simply seeing each other's work, but would have preferred more opportunities for discussion of the work following the presentations. Such discussions would have made it possible for the person giving the presentation to get the reactions of other participants to his work; and for the others to raise questions about why and how things were done in a certain way, and to relate the work to their own relevant experiences. In other words, indications are that participants wanted more opportunities for exchange among themselves--including presentations of their own work, but not restricted to this activity--to be built into the total program. They wanted the Seminar to bring in more deliberately the participants' own experiences and contributions. Thus, one participant said:

> I would have liked to have seen more coming together to exchange ideas, to talk about our respective countries.

Several participants pointed out that opportunities for exchange could be maximized if they were planned more deliberately and included as part of the formal program:

> The people in the Seminar should have an opportunity to defend their work, to make presentations like those that

> the guests made. There should not be just a brief showing of their films.
>
> I would have liked for everyone here to be given a time for a short talk--not just to show a film, but to lecture on what has been done in their country in radio and television.
>
> I thought that it would be a multi-national Seminar, that there would be more discussion of each participant's country's broadcasting. But, these discussions are mainly operated by the Fellows on their free time outside of the Seminar. . . . I think we should have more time to include this in the Seminar schedule.

One participant seemed to feel that the problem was not merely one of providing more time for exchanges in the schedule, but also one of providing a framework within which such exchanges can be carried out:

> . . . Some framework should have been worked out so the members could have made more of a contribution to the Seminar from their own experience. . . . We were given an opportunity to plan some programs ourselves, but we had no particular framework for it. It is not enough to tell people to spontaneously share their experiences. People are a bit shy, and they need a framework within which to make their contributions.

The disappointment with the limited amount of opportunity for exchange among participants was probably due to three interrelated reasons. First, some participants seemed to feel that their own potential contributions were not sufficiently utilized. Thus, one participant, when asked how the others reacted to the special program that he had presented, replied as follows:

> In the main, they were very well interested in it. There could have been more of an informal discussion. I thought I would do more about talking about my particular experiences. I came prepared to offer a great amount.

A second reason for disappointment was that some participants would have liked to obtain more systematic information about activities in other countries. One participant said, for example:

> Discussion groups, with each country telling what they are doing in each country, would have been helpful. Actually it seems that one should have discussions in which the ideas of the various countries would be aired, they should be jotted down by someone, and a pamphlet should be gotten out as to what the other countries are doing, so that we could take something away from here on the other countries, rather than just information about America.

The same participant pointed to a third source of disappointment--the limited opportunity to benefit from the reactions of others to one's own work:

> One thing I thought would happen that didn't happen is that I thought all the people attending would be given time to tell the others what they themselves are doing in their country. I suppose the Seminar thought that these kinds of things would be done privately and informally. As it was, people with film shows could say what they are doing in their country; but if you don't have a film show, you're finished. There is not much time spent saying what you have been doing and how one could improve what he has been doing. There is not much opportunity to air what you have been doing, to have people criticize you, and point out ways of improving these things.

At least by implication, this and other remarks about the opportunities for exchange among participants bring us back to a point that was stressed in the preceding section: some participants would have preferred a more problem-oriented approach, a greater focusing on specific issues directly related to their professional activities.

Effects of Group Composition on the Professional Experience. The nature of the professional experience is, of course, partly a function of the composition of the group. As has already been pointed out, the group was heterogeneous with respect to level of development of television in the countries represented, with respect to the primary professional interests of the participants, and with respect to types of professional positions held by the participants. The general reaction to the diversity of the group was favorable, although, as we have noted, eight participants spontaneously remarked that the composition of the group was too heterogeneous. When asked specifically about the multi-national composition of the group, thirteen indicated that they considered it beneficial, while fourteen expressed mixed feelings about this feature of the Seminar.

One of the benefits ascribed to the multi-national character of the Seminar (by eleven respondents) was that it promoted a better understanding and appreciation of countries with different cultural and political institutions. One participant, for example, pointed out that it gave him an opportunity to learn about the opinions held in other countries. "Every day you get an image of the whole world," he added. A larger number (eighteen respondents) considered the multi-national composition beneficial because it made possible an interchange of professional skills and ideas. It was precisely with respect to the specific professional gains they were able to derive from the diversity of the group, however, that participants' views differed. Some seemed to feel that the diversity did indeed enhance their professional gains, while others felt that it diminished their gains. Thus, fourteen participants indicated that the multi-national composition of the group had adverse effects because of the diversity of professional interests, backgrounds, or positions that it brought along with it. This does not mean that their reactions were entirely unfavorable, for some of these same individuals also saw value in the interchange of professional skills and ideas made possible by the multi-national composition.

Participants from countries with relatively limited experience and sophistication in the field of broadcasting were more likely to see professional value in the multi-national composition. Thus, sixteen respondents indicated that they found of special value certain technically superior presentations by fellow-participants working in highly advanced broadcasting systems; eleven of these sixteen respondents were non-European in origin. On the other hand, the participants who expressed mixed feelings about the value of the multi-national character of the Seminar, and the participants who noted adverse effects due to professional diversity were more likely to be European in origin and to come from countries with considerable experience in broadcasting. Presumably, these individuals felt that they had less to learn from a group representing different levels of development. There were exceptions to this pattern, however. One participant from a highly advanced broadcasting system, for example, when asked how much he benefited from the contributions of the other participants, replied as follows:

> Quite a lot. I have not learned much technically, but the Seminar has thrown light on the members as people, and their problems--the problems they are having with educational television, for example. I have learned about the setting in which they operate.

It seems reasonable to assume that this respondent (and probably others) valued the diversity because it gave him insights that he would be able to apply if, in the future, he is called upon to advise colleagues in countries with newly developing television systems. Thus, he was oriented not only to improving his own work, but also to improving his ability to assist others.

Several respondents felt that they would have preferred greater homogeneity in the level of professional knowledge or the level of sophistication of the participants. A somewhat larger number expressed a preference for greater homogeneity in the professional interests of the participants. Thus, when asked what he thinks of the make-up of the group, a participant in the field of educational broadcasting answered as follows:

> It is very good, but it would be better if all of them were in the same field. I can discuss professional things with some of them--we have the same vocabulary. With others, I can only talk about general things.

A participant from the field of news broadcasting answered as follows:

> Perhaps the whole group should have been people from school television. Perhaps that was the idea. Perhaps it would be better if all were from exactly the same interests. Some of us are newsmen, but the chorus is more concentrated on school television. You could make a separate Seminar for the school people and for the news people, and more would be gained.

Some participants, while concerned about the heterogeneity of interests, did not propose a more homogeneous composition. Rather, they suggested an alternative solution: breaking the total group into sub-groups for certain activities, in line with the particular professional interests of the participants. Thus, one participant commented:

> I think maybe one would achieve better results if one put all the people who were not in broadcasting in one group, and all the people in broadcasting in another group and then brought the two groups together from time to time.

Another participant suggested the following:

> I think there should have been room in the organization for smaller groups, or pairing off of those with related interests. They could get together with a visiting staff member or a member of the directorate. . . . If a portion of the group with similar interests could have got together for a bread-and-butter session about getting things on the air, it would have been quite helpful. But there is no use taking the whole group through that kind of session, and the larger sessions had to confine themselves to discussions in generalities.

In sum, it would appear that at least some of the Seminar participants felt that the heterogeneity in professional interests made it difficult to focus on specific problems. This difficulty can be resolved either by limiting the selection of participants in terms of more specific interest areas around which the Seminar could then focus; or by providing opportunities for sub-dividing the Seminar into special interest groups.

## Academic Activities

The major academic activity, as we have seen in Chapter 2, consisted of four series of weekly seminars dealing with various aspects of American society. In general, participants expressed a high degree of satisfaction with these academic seminars. Many of them, as we have seen, mentioned them spontaneously as especially positive aspects of the experience. Nineteen respondents described them in wholly positive terms; another seven regarded them as useful, though professionally irrelevant; only two felt they were essentially useless. Ten respondents, as a matter of fact, indicated that the value of the academic seminars surpassed their original expectations. The initial expectations for the academic seminars tended to be lower than those for the professional seminars--perhaps because participants were not entirely clear about their role and nature. In the final analysis, however, the participants as a group were at least as positive about the academic seminars as they were about the professional ones.

It is particularly instructive to examine which participants showed the greatest satisfaction with the academic seminars. In terms of professional interests, it turns out that five out of the seven participants in the field of news and current events were wholly satisfied with the academic seminars, and the remaining two considered them useful, though not professionally relevant. On the other hand, of the ten participants in the educational field, only four were wholly satisfied, four considered the seminars useful though professionally irrelevant, and two considered them both useless and irrelevant. The most reasonable interpretation of this finding seems to be that a participant's satisfaction with the academic seminars is related to the extent to which they fit in with his professional needs. Much of the content of the academic seminars--particularly the information about American political and legal institutions--was of direct interest to the participants in the news field. On the other hand, it had little relevance to the specific professional concerns of participants in educational broadcasting. Most of them found the academic seminars of some general interest and value. As one participant commented: "These things are not necessary to my work, but they did help me to understand America." It is understandable, however, that their level of satisfaction is not as high and that they felt that the academic seminars occupied too much time and received too much emphasis in the total program. One of the educational broadcasters said, for example:

> . . . I felt that rather than listen to how justice was administered here and about the Negro problem, I would have preferred to go out and watch actual production in a television studio.

Another factor that seems to be related to the level of satisfaction with the academic seminars is the relevance of the participants' general background to the content of these seminars. A rough indication of this point is the fact that participants of European origin were somewhat more likely to single out the academic seminars for praise than non-Europeans. It would seem that their general cultural and educational background provided more immediate points of contact with the material presented in the academic seminars. They were able to connect with the issues raised in the seminars more readily. A related factor here seems to be language facility. Language problems were cited most often, as the reason for their concern, by participants who were dissatisfied with their own roles in the academic seminars. Language difficulty was more of a barrier in the academic seminars than in the professional ones, presumably because the latter were more directly tied to the participants' day-to-day activities.

The most frequent basis for praise of the academic seminars was that they provided participants the opportunity to learn about American (mentioned by twenty respondents). One participant, for example, in answer to the question "How much useful, new information do you feel you acquired from these seminars?" replied as follows:

> Well, in some fields more and in some less. But even in those where there was no new information, I got a new light on some things. Really, I can't say enough in praise of these academic seminars. I think they were first-rate. If you are going to do broadcasting to a people, you should know something about their politics, their philosophy and so forth, and this Seminar has given us a very

> good chance to learn this about America. I think, in fact, that I know more about America now than I do about my own country.

The function of the seminars was generally perceived as that of providing background information about America--a function that most of the participants considered valid and important. It is in that context, then, that they judged the effectiveness of the seminars. Some of the participants saw the increased understanding of American society provided by the academic seminars as particularly useful preparation for their travel period. Another source of praise of the seminars was the high competence of the speakers (mentioned by twelve respondents). Six respondents praised them for their effectiveness of teaching. Six were particularly pleased with the frankness and objectivity with which information about America was presented. None of the participants expressed any feeling that the seminars were being used, in any way, to propagandize them.

Criticisms of the academic seminars fell into two categories: those concerned with their method or manner of presentation; and those concerned with their content. Nine participants brought up criticisms related to the methods that were used. Specifically, the following points were raised in this connection: there should have been more use of audio-visual aids; written outlines or resumes of the lectures should have been prepared; there should have been a greater use of concrete examples and case histories in the course of the lectures, and less recourse to statistics and broad generalizations; the lectures were often too fast and too complicated; and there was not enough opportunity for discussion. Not surprisingly, the participants who had some language difficulty were the most likely to be critical of the way in which the seminars were conducted. One of them commented as follows:

> I could understand seventy or eighty per cent of the lectures in the professional seminars, but the academic seminars are very difficult. I could understand the general problems, but I could not understand special subjects. I do not know technical terms. . . . I cannot help hesitating to ask questions. . . . If before the lecture some outline or chart or illustration was given out, we could understand more.

One participant suggested that it would have been valuable to use a comparative approach, to bring in related experiences from other countries. While he was the only person to bring up this point, it may be worth quoting him because of the relevance of his remarks to our earlier discussion of professional exchange among participants:

> I think it would have been better if several members of the group had been specifically requested to prepare short statements or a paper on aspects of their own country. For example, the operation of the courts or the parliamentary system. . . . I think it would have been better if we could have had a more comparative perspective. Also, we could have had more discussion. . . . It would have been well if we could have drawn out what some of the partici-

pants had to offer. They would have got a sense of doing something for the group, and also the group would have benefited from their experience and point of view.

Criticisms related to the content of the academic seminars were raised by eight participants. A number of people felt that material which could easily be obtained from written sources available in their own countries should have been kept to a minimum. Some people would have liked to see more emphasis on certain specific areas that were of special interest to them, such as foreign policy or literature and the arts. In some cases, these preferences reflect an interest in those aspects of American society that are more directly germane to the participant's specific professional concerns. Thus, one educational broadcaster told us that he would have preferred less emphasis in the academic seminars on political issues, and more emphasis on such topics as parent-child relationships and the role of children in American society. Needless to say, participants in the news field were satisfied with the political emphasis.

There was some feeling that too much emphasis was being placed on race relations in America. Some participants viewed this as a special American problem which was of little interest to them. The point was also made that, in emphasizing race relations, the Seminar was satisfying the interests of the African participants, at the expense of the participants from other parts of the world. It is difficult to separate reactions on this topic, however, from reactions specific to the seminar on American social structure. The leader of this seminar devoted a large proportion of his time to problems of race, and presented his point of view in a manner that antagonized many of the participants. In view of the special circumstances under which the race issue was introduced, it would be hazardous to generalize too much from this particular experience. There is no reason to conclude that participants would be disinterested in an objective presentation of race relations within the context of American society. As a matter of fact, it can be assumed that at least some of the participants would view with suspicion any attempt to play this topic down.

## Personal and Social Aspects of the Experience

Advance Information and Preparation. Our interviews revealed a number of areas in which some of the participants would have preferred to have more advance information and preparation. A very brief review of these points may help to alert us to some of the problems that might arise and that should therefore be anticipated.

One area in which participants want to have fairly detailed advance information is the nature and purpose of the Seminar. They want to know about the activities that are planned, the different sub-parts of the Seminar, their own role within it, the reason why they were selected, and the criteria used in composing the group. Without this information, they find it difficult to make the necessary preparations, and experience some discomfort, since they do not know what to expect and what is expected of them. Many participants felt that they had a very good idea of the Seminar before they came, but some indicated that they did not have enough advance information or that information from different sources seemed to be different in some respects. Nine felt that information about the purposes of the Seminar was insufficient or unclear; thirteen felt that information about the content of the Seminar was not entirely adequate.

Some participants would have liked more advance information about certain practical arrangements. They indicated that they might have done things differently had they had the necessary information on which to base a decision. Thus, for example, one participant might have brought his wife, had he known this was feasible. Another might have made arrangements for a car, had he known more about the transportation situation.

Finally, some participants found certain of the procedures and requirements relating to travel to the United States and entry into the country unpleasant and arbitrary. They would probably have been less disturbed if they had been prepared for these details in advance and given some explanation of their necessity.

Use of Free Time. There was a general feeling that the Seminar schedule did not leave enough free time for the participants. Sixteen of our respondents, as we have already noted, felt that the schedule was generally too crowded, making it difficult for participants to absorb all the experiences they were exposed to. One participant told us, for example:

> . . . between lunches and cocktails and speeches--I must say it is interesting, but you cannot always absorb everything. One thing I feel might have been taken into consideration is that some people come from countries with a different tempo of life. It takes some time to get used to this high pressure.

Seven participants felt that the distribution of scheduled activities, and not necessarily the total amount, was the issue. Thus, one participant commented:

> . . . it could have been better sorted out. Some days we were overworked, and some days were too lax.

A number of reasons for wanting more free time were mentioned by participants. Five indicated that they would have wanted more free time for informal exchange among the participants themselves. Five individuals mentioned that they would have wanted more free time for independent work or study. As one respondent pointed out:

> . . . we were very busy, so I couldn't read the books or materials that were given by some lecturers. Day and night we have some schedule. I want to have some leisure to research materials and books. I want some consideration for someone like me with poor English ability.

Nine participants indicated that they would have wanted more free time for leisure activities. Here, of course, the opportunities available for leisure activities must be taken into consideration.

Thus, 21 participants gave some indication that the location of the university made it difficult for them to use their free time to best advantage. Since the university was far from town and transportation was not always readily available, they did not have easy access to recreational and cultural activities that they might have been interested in. Some participants mentioned that the arrangement of contracting for all meals at the university also tended to limit their freedom of movement since it created a financial incentive for remaining on campus for all meals. Finally, some participants would have liked to have certain additional facilities available at the university during their free periods. For example, they pointed out that the library was usually closed by the time their schedule allowed them to get there.

Social Activities. As noted in Chapter 2, one of the main social events arranged for the group was a weekend of private hospitality with families in a small New Hampshire town. Even though some participants originally had misgivings about the private hospitality, it turned out to be the most successful social activity. Almost all of the participants (26 out of the 28) reacted very favorably to this experience. They appreciated the opportunity to relax for a weekend, to meet Americans outside of their own professional field, and to get inside an American home. For example, one participant spontaneously mentioned this visit as the most noteworthy thing that had happened to him during the first few weeks of the Seminar. He added:

> Maybe that's the only time we'll get inside an American home. It was very enjoyable. We were really inside, en famille. There was no need to probe for what was really happening; we could actually see.

Another participant nominated this visit as his most enjoyable experience:

> I could spend two days in a private house and live with children and in the household, and enjoy their music, food, sightseeing, boating, a very beautiful place on the lakeside.

Most participants also appreciated the other social activities that were planned. A number of them mentioned that they felt people were being very kind and considerate in their attempts to arrange these activities. Nevertheless, twelve participants felt that not enough social activities--at least of a certain kind--had been planned. The younger members of the group were particularly prone to raise this criticism. (Of the twelve participants who felt that not enough social activities had been planned, eight were below the median age--i.e., between the ages of 25 and 40; and four were above the median age--i.e., between the ages of 41 and 54.) Eight respondents indicated that they would have wanted more opportunities to go to theatres, concerts, or other cultural events. Eight participants indicated that they would have liked more opportunities to meet people from the area, aside from professional colleagues, perhaps in informal social gatherings. Five individuals mentioned that they would have liked more organized entertainment for the group, such as parties for the participants and some compatible people from the area.

The participants' feeling that not enough social activities were planned can be understood more clearly in conjunction with a related criticism, raised by fourteen respondents, namely, the feeling that there were not enough opportunities for spontaneous social activities. It is apparent that the feeling that not enough social activities were planned does not reflect a preference for more organized activities involving the entire group. Rather, it reflects a desire for a larger number of opportunities to engage in a variety of leisure time activities, including activities selected spontaneously by individual participants. If given access to the necessary facilities, many of the participants would be quite capable of arranging their own social activities, as they did during the travel period. Because of the distance of the campus from most of the activities in which they were interested, however, participants were limited in the arrangements they could make on their own. Thus, it would seem that the needs of most participants would have been satisfied, not by a larger number of organized activities, but by the facilitation of spontaneously selected activities--e.g., through arranging transportation, making available tickets for various events, and providing opportunities for informal contacts with Americans.

It must be kept in mind, of course, that not all participants are equally comfortable about establishing social contacts or arranging their own entertainment. Both personality factors and cultural factors are likely to make a difference here. Participants with a limited command of English would have special problems, as would women, especially from non-Western countries. For these participants some of the organized social activities may be less burdensome and hence more attractive. In line with this, we did find great variability in the way in which participants reacted to the organized social activities. Some enjoyed them greatly. Others would probably have preferred to have a variety of types of social activities available, from which they could have selected those that were most congenial to them. Such an arrangement would have had the added advantage of conducting most of the social and recreational activities with smaller sub-groups, which would allow for a smoother and more personal operation.

Personal Relations. As might be expected in a multi-national seminar, there were some differences in attitudes and values between the participants. On the whole, these differences did not seem to create much friction within the group. Only four respondents felt that the participants did not function as a congenial group. The remainder were evenly split between those who saw the participants as a very congenial group (twelve) and as a moderately congenial group. Those who noted some friction within the group most often attributed it to personal idiosyncrasies of some of the members (eight), to conflicting ideologies (five), or to lack of common interests(four). Some participants considered the differences in attitudes and values within the group as a valuable feature of the experience. One mentioned, for example, that there were

> . . . recognized differences. These, I feel, have a political background. But it's just as well to expose one's viewpoint to the other. I think it was good. They got to know that there were other views. Whether they changed does not interest me.

In a very few cases, however, participants were sensitive to differences between themselves and others--perhaps in political or religious views--and felt that these affected their personal relationships.

Occasionally, a participant expressed the feeling that others in the group were in a more advantaged position. To a large extent, this was related to differences in language facility. Thus, one respondent commented:

> . . . some people are not so good in English. They hesitate to ask questions because their English is poor, and if they are preparing their questions, other people speak up in the meantime. It sometimes happens to me. I find it difficult to intervene. Some people speak very little or nothing at all. If you are better in English and the questions are not so important--it is easy to ask questions. Another man may have something more important to ask--but he may not have a chance to speak. Knowledge of English is very important.

Occasionally, the feeling was expressed that some of the participants were accorded preferential treatment. Thus, a participant from an Asian country told us that

> . . . sometimes treatment by members of the staff was not the same. I think the staff was partial towards some members of the Seminar--those from Europe and those who, perhaps, speak English better and feel freer to talk. . . . Sometimes when there was not enough for the whole group, they got special preference. One time there was not enough tickets; so they got the tickets and some others did not get them. Then there were some other things, like books and invitations by the staff. . . . I think things like that should be more equal. If they did not have enough for everybody, they should not give to anybody. This might be all right in America, but I think when you deal with a foreign people it is more difficult, because foreigners are liable to consider that discrimination.

These comments serve to remind us very clearly of the sensitivities that participants--especially from non-European countries--bring to the situation. They often feel that their own countries are undervalued by Americans and by Europeans, and are especially sensitive to any act that would confirm this expectation.

The complexity of the reactions that may arise in a multinational setting is demonstrated by another criticism that was raised by some participants. They expressed the feeling that the interests and problems of the African participants tended to play a disproportionately large role in the Seminar. This is yet another indication that concern with national status is likely to play an important role in this kind of situation, and that participants will feel resentful if, subjectively, they experience a status deprivation.

A person may experience a sense of status deprivation not only if he feels that his nation has somehow been slighted, but also if he feels that he personally has not been accorded the status that is due him. This may explain, in part, why seven of the participants commented on the youthfulness of some of the members of the staff. Some of the comments seemed to convey the feeling that this represented a lack of recognition of the importance of the participants' positions.

## Recommendations

From this analysis of participant reactions we can formulate a series of recommendations for multi-national seminars that might be organized in the future. These recommendations represent our view of the implications of the findings and, inevitably, are influenced by our own values and opinions.

### A. Recommendations concerning professional activities

(1) A certain degree of homogeneity of group composition--in terms of a focal problem with which all participants are professionally concerned--would seem to be desirable. This does not simply mean an area in which all participants have an intellectual interest (such as the mass media of communication), but one directly related to their specific professional activities. As long as, at some level, there is such a shared problem on which all participants can come together, there can and should be divergences in background, experience, and professional role. An arrangement completely consistent with this recommendation, for example, is one proposed by the organizers of the Seminar under study for the inclusion of two types of participants in future seminars: representatives from broadcasting systems who are concerned with educational programs, and representatives from ministries of education and other agencies that set policy for educational broadcasting (see Chapter 5). While these two groups are engaged in rather different activities, they do have common problems that are of direct professional concern to them and that can serve as the focal point for the Seminar.

(2) Opportunities for alternative activities should be built into the Seminar program, so that wherever there are divergent interests, sub-groups can be formed around specific issues and can operate separately. There is no reason to assume that all participants will engage in all of the organized activities. In the course of some of the general discussions, held at the beginning of the Seminar, various specific problems, of special concern to some of the participants, may suggest themselves. The program should be so structured that there is room in it for small work-groups to form around such problems. For many other purposes, of course, the group can continue to meet as a whole.

(3) The principle by which the Seminar is organized should, ideally, be in terms of problems, rather than entirely in terms of speakers. That is, there should be some organized framework, defined in terms of general issues in the focal area of concern, which provides continuity for the whole program. Individual speakers should be scheduled in line with this framework, and should know

how and where they fit into it. Participants too should have advance information about this organizing framework. A problem-oriented organization of this sort implies that the primary basis for planning professional activities is their relevance to the direct professional concerns of the participants. Thus, in a seminar for broadcasting specialists, the central content would not be simply coverage of what goes on in American broadcasting. Naturally, in the course of the Seminar, participants would have the opportunity to learn about American broadcasting activities, and we know that this is of great interest to them. These activities, however, should represent special cases of general, shared problems, to which the participants can readily connect in terms of their own interests and experiences. To maintain the focus of the professional seminars around the professional concerns of the participants, and avoid their preemption by information about America, there may even be some virtue in separating out the discussion of American mass media *per se* and devoting a special "academic" seminar to this purpose. Such a seminar could be broadened to include information, presented by the participants, about parallel activities in their respective countries.

(4) *In emphasizing problem-orientation, we do not want to neglect the value of introducing to the participants outstanding American personalities in their own field*. This does seem to be a valued part of the experience for most of the participants. It can still be done, even within the problem-oriented framework, as long as invited speakers are selected in terms of their relevance to the focal problems. Also, certain outstanding personalities can be invited for special sessions outside of the general organizing framework, for example, for special evening meetings.

(5) *The approach recommended here does presuppose that there will be fewer invited speakers, with more time for each, and with greater opportunities for following up on each speaker's presentation*. Each speaker would serve as a starting point for discussion and exchange. This more intensive interaction with each speaker would make it possible to go beyond questions and answers, and to explore concrete issues in greater depth. At the same time, it would make it more possible for participants to bring in their own relevant experiences, and thus provide *opportunities for exchange among the participants themselves*. They would be able to learn more adequately about each other's situations, and to benefit from the reactions of others.

(6) *A logical extension of the idea of bringing invited speakers to the Seminar for longer periods of time is the possibility of including several Americans as regular participants in the Seminar*. They would be specialists whose central professional concerns are the same as those of the other participants. Ideally, these American specialists would remain with the Seminar during the entire period that foreign visitors are resident at the university. A possible compromise might be to have these American participants come for a period of one or two weeks. The essence of this recommendation, however, is that these Americans would not come as invited speakers, but as regular participants, who have a direct professional interest in the focal problems of the Seminar, and who see themselves as involved in an exchange activity, rather than simply in information-

giving. While this recommendation is not derived directly from the comments of our respondents, we feel that it has an unusual potential for creating a favorable climate for cultural and educational exchange.

(7) A possible concrete procedure for combining some of the recommendations made above would be something as follows: The professional seminars might be organized in terms of a central problem for each week. If the Seminar does not include American participants for the entire period, as suggested above, then at least an attempt would be made to include some Americans who remain with the Seminar for the entire week devoted to a particular problem. The first part of the week would be devoted to exploration and formulation of the problem by the participants (with the Americans taking part in these discussions as regular participants). In the course of these explorations, different participants would be called upon to make specific presentations, to lead discussions, or to give relevant demonstrations. During the latter part of each week, an American expert in the area under discussion would be invited to speak, to give demonstrations, to participate in discussion, and to serve as a resource person to the group. This particular format is presented here merely as an example of one possible way of organizing the Seminar so as to include the desiderata that have been discussed.

The recommendations we have listed are based on the assumption that the specific professional concerns of the participants must provide the basic context of a satisfactory and effective exchange experience. We would emphasize problem-orientation, therefore, as the organizing principle for the typical exchange program. Other major points that should have wide applicability are the importance of providing the participants with an opportunity to make personal contributions to the program, and to bring in relevant experiences from their own countries; and finally, the importance of providing visitors with the opportunity of working and talking with American colleagues, as equal partners on shared professional problems.

## B. Recommendations concerning academic activities

It is apparent from the reactions of the participants that the idea of combining academic seminars with the more specific professional activities is very worthwhile, and we recommend that it be maintained in future seminars. In planning such academic seminars, several considerations should be kept in mind.

(1) Any group of specialists will include some who are interested in a variety of general topics. For many, however, interest in the academic seminars is likely to be a direct function of their relevance to their particular professional concerns. Thus, specialists in news broadcasting are more likely to be interested in political topics, while specialists in instructional broadcasting are more likely to be interested in family relations. In devising an academic program, one should, therefore, take into account explicitly the particular professional interests that the participants represent. It is probably safe to assume that the majority of almost any group of specialists will have some interest in the general political and legal structure of the United States. Very likely, a review of

general intellectual trends within the United States will be of interest at least to a sub-group of the participants. It would seem reasonable, therefore, to include such seminars in the program. Additional academic offerings, however, should be planned with deliberate attention to the composition of the group and to the aspects of American life that are most directly relevant to their professional specialties.

(2) Within the limits set by practical considerations, it would be a good idea to structure the academic program in such a way that the seminars represent a series of offerings within which participants can choose those that are of greatest interest to them. One mechanism might be to arrange several academic seminars; have each seminar leader give a general lecture during the first week, in which he summarizes his major points; and then let each participant choose one or two seminars, dealing with those topics into which he wants to delve more deeply.

(3) Since the academic seminars often involve concepts and terms that are outside of the participants' fields of specialization, language problems are likely to become especially acute. If, therefore, there are participants whose facility in English is limited, some attempts should be made to take this into account in the planning of the academic seminars. For example, it might be helpful to prepare written outlines and summaries. Of course, if necessary funds could be made available, it would be most useful here to make some provision for simultaneous translation.

(4) The value of the academic seminars is not restricted to the specific information that is communicated, but it also includes the opportunity to interact and exchange ideas with some American intellectuals. This was, of course, a major reason why the organizers of the Seminar under study were especially eager to hold it on the university campus. In view of this, it would be valuable if the leaders of the academic seminars could be integrated into the general program. For example, they should be encouraged to spend time in informal contacts with the participants, to be present at some of the meals, or to invite the participants to their homes. The combination of interaction in the course of the seminars with such informal contacts outside of the seminars is likely to enhance the value of both.

## C. Recommendations concerning personal and social aspects of the experience

(1) In communicating with participants in advance of the Seminar, it is important to keep in mind that they are coming into a strange and ambiguous situation, which requires both practical and psychological preparation on their part. They should be given as much information as possible, to facilitate this process of preparation. In particular, the following kinds of information should be provided: (a) a clear and consistent description of the purpose and structure of the Seminar, which will tell participants what to expect and what is expected of them; (b) any information about alternative arrangements that are possible, which would help them in planning and allow them to choose in line with their own

preferences; and (c) any information that might help them anticipate problematic, unpleasant, or seemingly arbitrary situations.

(2) In arranging the schedule, free time should not simply be equated with unscheduled time, but rather it should be planned deliberately, with specific attention to the over-all program in which the participants are engaged. Free time should be scheduled in relation to the general flow of activities; it should be introduced at points at which participants are likely to need time for absorbing new material, for reflection, or for relaxation. Only under very special circumstances should free time that has been set aside for these purposes be usurped by new additions to the program. Moreover, free time should be scheduled in such a way that it can be used to maximum advantage. For example, if participants have some free time in town during the afternoon, it would usually be a good idea to avoid scheduling activities for that evening, so that they can take the fullest advantage of their trip into town.

(3) In arranging facilities, the daily pattern of activities in which the participants will be engaged should be taken into account in a deliberate way. Thus, transportation, meals, library services, recreational facilities, and so on, should all be arranged in such a way that participants can use their free time to maximum advantage, i.e., that they can conveniently pursue the activities they are interested in during the time that is available to them.

(4) In planning social and recreational activities, it is important to keep in mind that organized activities for the group as a whole, while often valuable and favorably received by many participants, should be supplemented with other kinds of opportunities. Wherever possible, activities should be organized in such a way that participants can choose between different alternatives and can be formed into smaller sub-groups. A more individualized arrangement of this sort would both take into account their diversified interests, and allow for a more congenial atmosphere. Moreover, quite apart from any organized activities, it is important to help participants in making their own arrangements for social and recreational activities. It would be necessary to acquaint them with the available possibilities, to find out what they would like to do, and then to facilitate it in whatever way is indicated. In some cases, this may simply mean giving information, purchasing tickets, and arranging transportation. In other cases, a greater degree of assistance may perhaps be required. The important point is to acquaint participants with the range of opportunities available and to make sure that they are able to take advantage of them.

(5) Above all, it is important to provide opportunities for the participants to interact with Americans on an informal, personalized basis. Informal gatherings can be arranged at the university, to which members of the community are invited. This would allow participants to meet Americans from various walks of life, and possibly to arrange subsequent contacts with them. Also, some gatherings in private homes can be arranged, to which participants, along with members of the community, can be invited. Ideally, these would be relatively small gatherings, including only several participants at a time. Finally, private hospitality for individual participants in American homes should be encouraged as much as possible. For

some participants, such invitations may develop spontaneously out of their informal contacts with Americans; for others, they may have to be specially arranged.

(6) _In the selection and briefing of staff, special attention should be paid to the national and personal sensitivities that participants are likely to bring to the situation_. Thus, for example, it is important to be aware of the possibility that individual participants, who are identified with a minority point of view, might sometimes feel or in fact be rejected by others in the group. While this cannot always be prevented, one must insure, insofar as possible, that these participants not be completely isolated from the rest of the group. Similarly, it is essential to avoid any implication of preferential treatment for some national groups as compared to others. While it may not be possible to prevent the arousal of national sensitivities entirely, the staff should be prepared for such sensitive reactions when they do occur and at least make sure that there has been no legitimate cause for their occurrence. Finally, it is important to keep in mind that the participants are not students, but mature people in responsible positions in their own countries, and that they must be accorded the status that they consider due them.

# CHAPTER 5

# STAFF REACTIONS TO THE UNIVERSITY PHASE OF THE SEMINAR

At the end of the six-week period at the university, members of the research team held interviews with the directors of the Seminar, the instructors of the four academic seminars, and members of the administrative staff. The purpose of these interviews was to find out how they reacted to the first phase of the Seminar -- to what extent they felt that it achieved its goals, what they saw as its high point and its problems -- its successes and its failures, and what ideas it gave them for future seminars of this sort.

The reactions of the directors are of primary importance here, since they had a better overview on the entire program than the other staff members and since they were, of course, in the best position to implement changes in future programs. The directors were generally satisfied with the success of the Seminar. They were particularly pleased with the level of interest and support shown by the invited speakers. They thought that the blend between professional and academic activities was a very desirable feature of the Seminar, that should be maintained in future seminars, although it could bear some improvement. They were pleased with the quality of the participants and their contributions and with the way they got along with each other; and felt that the combination of participants from developing and industrialized countries was a desirable feature, to be maintained. They were well aware of a number of problems that had arisen, including the inadequate integration of academic and professional seminars, the failure to integrate participants' own presentations into the overall program, the limited technical facilities for presenting some of the materials the participants had brought, the occasional language difficulties, the scarcity of unscheduled time, the inadequate transportation facilities, and the limited administrative personnel. Some of these concerns -- especially those relating to personnel and transportation -- were echoed by members of the administrative staff, who also brought up a number of other problems relating to the details of the living arrangements at the University.

On the whole, the perceptions of the Seminar directors seemed to match those of the participants fairly closely. Like the participants (or at least a sizeable segment of the participants), they listed the inclusion of academic seminars, the high quality of some of the professional speakers, and the visits to broadcasting, educational, and other facilities among the highlights of the Seminar. They also showed awareness of some of the problems that seemed particularly salient to many of the participants: the relative lack of depth and opportunity for contributions by participants in the professional seminars; the tendency to overschedule the time; the inadequacy of transportation, especially in view of the isolation of the campus; and the presence of certain inconveniences relating to administrative details. They did not seem to be aware of the dissatisfactions with their leisure time activities expressed by a number of the participants; nor did they seem to be as cognizant of the problems arising from the heterogeneous group composition that were stressed by a vocal subgroup of the participants. It may be that on these issues participants felt less free to communicate their disappointments to the directorate.

## Professional Seminars

The Seminar directors were pleased with the quality of the outside speakers who were brought in for various professional seminars. They felt that the participants were also satisfied with this part of the program and that they "got much out of it, even if they wouldn't absorb it all. It will take effect later." They indicated that those lecturers who accompanied their presentations with film demonstrations of their work were particularly effective and well received.

While satisfied with most of the individual sessions, the Seminar directors did express some criticisms of the over-all design of the professional part of the program. They felt that it needed a clearer structure, that too many sessions were scheduled, that there was some overlap and repetitiousness among speakers -- points that were also made, as we have seen in the preceding chapter, by a number of the participants. Thus, one director told the interviewer:

> I think perhaps the professional seminars could have a clearer design. We tried that, but it broke down a little. . . . A clearer design, less redundancy, a few less people. During the introductory period, or through some kind of control while the program is going on, it could be more carefully coordinated.

One of the suggestions made for improving coordination and enhancing the relationship between the different sessions in future seminars was the institution of an advance planning meeting of the various professional speakers, which would allow them to divide the domain among them and to work out their contributions in full knowledge of the over-all design.

Visits to facilities and direct involvement in some of their activities were seen by the directors as very useful parts of the experience, which they would want to expand in future seminars. For example, one director said:

> I think the field trips and the laboratory experiences -- like working with the local educational TV staff -- these were good, and more of them should be planned. Those kind of laboratory experiences are very valuable.

The purpose of these visits, as seen by the directors, was not to provide technical training for the participants, but to give them an opportunity for more thorough and detailed observation of procedures used in the United States.

The directors were aware of the fact that opportunities for participants to make contributions to the professional seminars were limited and indicated that "in the future it would be desirable to integrate these programs. . . more totally into the whole program." They were also aware that "the technical facilities for showing films were less than adequate . . . /and/ equipment for presentation of program material should be improved."

It should be noted, in this connection, that the amount of active participation in the professional seminars varied from session to session. Our group observer reported that the participants' interest and involvement fluctuated, depending on speaker and topic. Some sessions were too general to meet the specialized interests of many of the participants; some were too specialized to be of interest to those in other areas. There were sessions, however, in which there was considerable participation; others in which only a few participants made active contributions but in which the over-all level of interest was nonetheless high. The most frequent form that participants' contributions took was the introduction of examples from the experiences of their respective countries and the drawing of parallels between their own broadcasting situation and the situation in America.

To return to the reactions of the directors, we have already noted that they were pleased with the group composition and were not as concerned about the problem caused by heterogeneity that several of the participants (though a distinct minority) stressed. They did feel that diversity of background posed some problems for the professional seminars, but concluded that these were small compared to the positive values of a diverse group. Thus, one director said:

> Some of the people who knew a great deal about what was said had to sit through things they weren't interested in. I don't think there was much of that though. The advantages outweighed the disadvantages of diversity. . . . Language was a factor. Those whose English wasn't as good got a little less out of it. . . . Those who were more developed could talk with more shorthand or at a different level. This was some disadvantage to those who don't know the technical side of television. But, on balance, the pluses outweighed the minuses. Some of the individuals might have preferred a more sophisticated and esoteric discussion.

Very similar sentiments were expressed by the other director, when asked about the effects of diversity on the professional experience of the participants:

> On the whole it was very good. This kind of diverse background was mutually exciting. They got a lot from each other. The idea of having two from each country . . . was good. . . . In the professional seminars, most of them got something on their own level. Some of them probably felt a bit left out. Particularly if the lack of development was also coupled with a language problem. . . . In some cases, those on the most sophistical level may have been somewhat bored and found some redundancy. On the whole, getting people from different levels and different backgrounds was a good idea.

These sentiments, while not universal, certainly seemed to be shared by a majority of the participants.

Academic Seminars

The directors felt that it was indeed important to include the academic seminars in the over-all design of the program, that they provided the participants with insights and background information about the United States that they could not have obtained in any other way, and that they were both stimulating and useful for the participants. Thus, one of the directors evaluated the academic seminars in these terms:

> Part of the purpose was to look below the surface. And this I believe we accomplished. In some of the conversations I had with participants, one told me that if he hadn't had the academic seminars he wouldn't have understood the technical details. Another told me that while we have a complicated system of democracy he had a feeling that it worked. A third told me that he felt that his attitude toward his own country had changed. . . . So, the seminar even helps them re-look at their own country. Someone told me that one of the big surprises was the candor with which we conducted the seminar.

The directors felt that, while the contents of the different seminars were right, it would be good to relate them to each other more effectively, and also to integrate them more fully with the professional seminars. They would have liked to see more leadership on the part of the participants themselves; and also a greater degree of involvement of the instructors of the academic seminars in the total program, with more opportunities for informal interaction with the participants.

The directors also pointed out that the spirit of inquiry and academic freedom that prevailed in the academic seminars provided effective demonstration that the program did not have a "manipulative" intent.

> We were able to be candid and present all of the less pleasant aspects of the society clearly. . . . This brought a fair amount of acceptance, enabling the participants to understand the U.S. better. . . . They realized that /the mass/ media are not instruments of the government as means of propaganda.

From all indications, the participants shared this impression.

The instructors of the academic seminars varied in their evaluation of their respective seminars and of the extent to which they had been able to achieve the goals they had set for themselves. On the whole, however, they tended to feel that they were at least moderately successful. The instructor who was least certain about his success felt that the participants' initial level of information about the United States was lower than he had anticipated, and that the materials he had assigned them to read were probably less than ideal, and were, in any event, generally left unread. In view of the diversity in language facility and educational background, he felt, it would have been better to use specially prepared materials, including graphic materials. It is interesting to read from the group observer's final summary of this particular seminar:

> The most striking aspect of this seminar was the shift that took place after the first session toward a heavy emphasis on factual material. . . . [The instructor] felt that the necessity of providing this material became obvious very early, and that a more broad, interpretive approach was out of the question until this foundation was constructed. He did in fact return, in his last session, to the attempt to draw some general deductions. . . . The defect in his method was that at points the factual material became far too detailed for the needs of the participants and they lost interest.
>
> The emphasis on details and factual information led to a great deal of participation of one kind in the seminar, namely the asking of very specific informational questions. The exception to this was, again, the last seminar where more general statements set the tone for the participants' broader remarks.
>
> This concentration on factual information allowed [the instructor] to cover a great deal of material. . . . He was admirably well-acquainted with the material he covered, but was not as successful in choosing the most suitable material in terms of level and degree of detail. However, the group generally reacted favorably to him and it was clear that he was personally satisfied with the job he was doing.

The group observer's final summary of the seminar that was judged most successful by the majority of the participants is also instructive:

> This seminar began on an uncomfortable footing, possibly due to [the instructor's] own discomfort. . . . The manner he adopted was one of . . . functioning on a very elementary level. Somewhere along the line, his presentation and the group reaction to it changed; . . . possibly it became apparent that they were really intrinsically interested in the subject matter. The atmosphere became one of greater comfort, which facilitated the free exchange of ideas.
>
> One component of this change in atmosphere was the decline in hostile behavior on the part of the members. This was illustrated in the last session when he was subjected to a series of questions which had completely undermined another leader's seminar. He handled himself so well that he received support and praise from the group. One of the keys to this was his emphasis on objectivity. True, the subject matter he dealt with made this stance easier for him than for some of the other seminar leaders, but he was extremely careful to differentiate between fact and personal opinion.
>
> His whole approach was a fairly informal one, which was fairly permissive of interruptions by the participants. Despite this "loose" approach, he covered a surprising amount of ground. . . without overburdening the Fellows

> with technical materials. The sessions also benefited from the degree of preparation invested in them by the seminar leader. This was not true of all the seminar groups. . . . The degree of preparation was also reflected in the material which he distributed to the members.
>
> . . . The level of the sessions was upgraded after the early sessions, and this change benefited the seminar in terms of interest level and reactions to the leader. The last session ended with prolonged and loud applause, which seemed to reflect the genuine feelings of admiration which the participants held for him and what he had accomplished. The general consensus among the participants was that his seminar had been the most successful of all.

These two instructors structured their sessions differently: the first placed his emphasis on the transmission of factual information, while the second took a more interpretive approach. In line with these different orientations, participation in the first seminar was mostly of the question-and-answer variety, while the second facilitated a freer exchange of ideas. Participants' reactions to the second seminar were clearly more enthusiastic, but they also found the first seminar to be of value. Both of these two instructors agreed that the academic seminars were a useful part of the total program. Thus, the first told the interviewer:

> . . . I think this is an important part of the program. I think this was proved conclusively. They need the factual information. This is absolutely necessary if they are to get a feeling for the American political system. . . . I think it is essential to discuss American national character, because it is on everyone's mind. It was not useful for some. In some cases, ideological bias prevented communication. It just served to confirm their bias. . . . This could be overcome by individual meetings between teachers and students informally. . . . This would be kind of a tutorial in conjunction with the actual lectures.

The second instructor spoke of his own seminar in these terms:

> Insofar as it succeeded it was useful, because they are in the area of communications. The subject matter is essential in understanding the trends in human relations. It has professional importance to them in terms of interpreting the U.S. to people back home. It permits a better interpretation of U.S. news. But the seminar can also be justified in terms of understanding what they see here.

## Recommendations for Future Seminars

Out of the interviews with the two directors, several recommendations for future seminars -- made by one or both of the respondents -- emerged. These can be summarized as follows.

(1) Selection. In selecting participants, it would be good to extend the geographic range to include, for example, representatives from Latin America, France, Poland, and Russia. As for areas of specialization, one director favored broadening the composition to include representatives from the newspaper field and other communication fields, while the other favored an even greater emphasis on educational broadcasting than prevailed in the present Seminar. Another suggestion involved the selection of a "team" from each country, including one representative from the broadcasting system and one individual with policy-making responsibilities in the area of educational broadcasting. Furthermore, it was recommended that the final responsibility for selection in each country be left to a selection committee made up of nationals of that country.

(2) Preparation. More advance preparation of participants could be desirable, to give them a better sense of what to expect from the Seminar.

(3) Timing. Future seminars, particularly if they are to emphasize educational broadcasting, should be scheduled at a time when schools are in session. It would be desirable to reduce the over-all length of the seminar, since it is difficult for most potential participants to take off four months. Within the Seminar, it would be best to design a less crowded program, leaving the participants more unscheduled time for themselves and for spontaneously developed activities.

(4) Professional seminars. The professional seminars should be designed more clearly and individual sessions coordinated more effectively. To this end, it would be useful to arrange a planning session for the various lecturers before the Seminar begins. More lectures and demonstrations in the field of educational radio should be included, in line with the importance of radio in many of the countries represented.

(5) Other professional activities. Visits to and affiliations with broadcasting facilities should be expanded, and more laboratory experiences should be provided for the participants. Audio-visual materials, teaching aids, bibliographic materials, etc., should be made available, both for demonstration purposes, and for the participants to take back with them when they leave. Greater opportunities for active participation in the Seminar should be created. To this end, it is important to provide more adequate facilities for the presentation of program materials that the participants bring with them.

(6) Academic activities. Better integration between academic and professional seminars would be desirable. A greater amount of interaction of the academic faculty with Seminar participants should be encouraged. More efforts should be made to bring in American Negroes as speakers in the academic (as well as the professional) part of the program.

(7) Administrative arrangements. More funds are needed for administrative staff during the university phase of the Seminar. Planning for the travel period should be set into motion at an earlier point.

Some of these recommendations are quite specific for the situation under study (and some of these were, in fact, implemented the following year). Some of the more general recommendations are similar to ones presented in the preceding chapter on the basis of interviews with the participants.

## CHAPTER 6

## PARTICIPANTS' REACTIONS TO THE TRAVEL PHASE

The participants' general evaluation of the second phase of their sojourn was very favorable. In the third interview, which was conducted in the field during the second month of the travel period, eighteen participants indicated that they were very satisfied with this portion of the trip, seven quite satisfied, three somewhat satisfied. (The comparable figures for the second interview, referring to the university phase, were seven very satisfied, fifteen quite satisfied, four somewhat satisfied, and two not too satisfied).

The high evaluation of the travel period is also manifested in later interviews. Thus, in the fourth interview--just before leaving the United States--eight participants singled out the travel period as the most valuable part of the Seminar; eighteen indicated that they gained more from the travel period than from their stay at the university. When asked about experiences that they found particularly meaningful or valuable during the total four-months stay, seventeen respondents cited the travel period. Specific experiences that probably occurred to a considerable degree during the travel phase were also brought up many times: first-hand exposure to American life (mentioned by 22 respondents); interpersonal experiences in relation to Americans, such as meeting Americans in their homes (seventeen); observation of local broadcasting facilities (sixteen); exposure to new program ideas (eleven); and observations of the physical environment (eleven).

Some months after the participants had returned home, the travel period still stood out in their memories. Among the features of the visit that exceeded their expectations, seventeen respondents mentioned the opportunity to travel throughout the United States. Seventeen respondents also mentioned the travel period as one of the most satisfying aspects of the experience; and many mentioned either the travel period as such or certain components of it among the most useful aspects of the experience.

The specific experiences cited (during the third interview) as having been especially important or enjoyable--as representing highlights of the trip--covered a wide range for most participants. Thus, 22 mentioned some professionally relevant experiences (e.g., visits to broadcasting stations); 21 mentioned interpersonal experiences (e.g., meeting "average" Americans); and 21 mentioned certain aspects of the physical environment (e.g., scenic or architectural wonders).

In describing their most important accomplishments during the trip, seventeen said that they had learned more about the pattern of mass communication in America; thirteen that they had learned more about America in general; and seven that they had acquired specific new professional skills, experience, or knowledge by working at a broadcasting station. Not all participants, to be sure, were able to accomplish all that they had hoped to. Seven mentioned that they were not able to observe all the mass media facilities that they had planned to observe, and nine that they were not able to meet all the people that they had planned to meet.

For more specific information about the sources of satisfaction and disappointment during the travel period, let us turn to the participants' reactions to the different aspects of this experience, as they expressed them in the third interview.

## Professional Activities

A major portion of the two months' travel, as we have already noted, was devoted to various professional activities, including visits to broadcasting stations and organizations in the field of broadcasting and related fields. Typically, participants paid short visits to a number of different facilities across the country, although sometimes they stayed at a single station for a more extensive period of time.

All but one of the participants had an opportunity to observe at one or more stations, and only two participants found this experience unsatisfactory. Half of the participants made very few comments or suggestions to the staff at the facilities they visited. The other half made many comments or suggestions and all indicated that these were well received. Only six participants actually had an opportunity to work at a station, and all of them found this experience satisfactory. Another nine participants indicated some disappointment in the fact that they did not have a chance to work at a station. We shall return to this point below.

In general, most participants expressed high satisfaction with the professional side of the trip. Eleven were wholly satisfied, while seventeen gave a mixed evaluation--being satisfied in some respects and dissatisfied in others.

Various reasons for satisfaction with the professional experience were brought up. Many participants were pleased because they were able to obtain a good picture of the great variety of approaches to broadcasting in America and of the range of activities in the field (mentioned by eighteen respondents). Many appreciated the fact that they met fellow-professionals who were very helpful to them (eighteen). Fifteen respondents mentioned that they learned many new things about broadcasting techniques that would be helpful to them after they returned home. Eleven told us that they obtained new ideas for programs. A number of participants indicated that they benefited more from discussions with the broadcasters in the field than they did from the ones they met at the university. While the latter were generally more impressive, the men in the field were more concrete and participants could talk to them about specific problems that they were facing. Thus, in comparing the broadcasters he met in the field to those he met at the university, one participant remarked:

> Experience-wise they might be inferior. Those people who came to speak to us were producers and directors. But the people at the stations had more time to talk with me personally about communications and the problems that we confront. We have exchanged more ideas.

Another respondent, who was attached to a station for a while, commented:

> They explain their program as they operate [it] . . . They show and talk about broadcasting in general, and at their stations in particular. They were able to answer specific questions and specific problems that I brought up.

The last comment reflects another source of satisfaction, which was mentioned by fifteen of the participants: the opportunity to work at a station or to observe its operations in detail. How profitable the participants found such opportunities can be illustrated with a comment from a program director who had paid a brief visit to the United States at an earlier point:

> I have learned about television production on the whole. And specifically I have learned what are some of the facilities that are needed for television programming and what some of the equipment and techniques are. The last time I was here I just visited stations. This time I actually worked in one and I got to know the people better and also some of the techniques. I saw how it actually works. I will be able to use some of this information when I go back to my own country. I also got some pretty good ideas about what is expected of us when we establish our own television system.

The opportunity for such direct involvement in an on-going operation seems to us to be one of the most important sources of satisfaction with the trip. Most of the participants who had this opportunity expressed very high satisfaction with their professional experience as a whole. (The results are even clearer when we look at the relationship in the other direction: nine out of the eleven participants who expressed unqualified satisfaction with their professional experience had this opportunity for direct involvement, as compared to six out of the remaining seventeen participants.) This may very well have been the high point of their trip, at least as far as its professional side is concerned.

While the general level of satisfaction with the professional experiences in the field was high, it seemed to vary systematically with the participant's area of specialization. Satisfaction was highest among the people in news broadcasting and almost equally high among those in general programming, but was clearly lowest among the people in educational broadcasting: only one of the eleven participants who expressed unqualified satisfaction with the professional experience was in the educational area. We can understand this relationship better if we look at some of the specific criticisms of the professional side of the trip that were raised. These criticisms fell into two major categories: the complaint that certain relevant people or facilities were inaccessible; and the feeling that the experiences were not sufficiently intensive.

As for the first criticism, nine respondents mentioned that they were unable to meet some of the people they wanted to see or spend enough time with them. None of the news broadcasters raised this point; by contrast, it came up in seven out of the ten interviews with educational broadcasters. Five of the people in the educational field registered the related complaint that they would have wanted more opportunities to see school facilities. The nature of the problem can be seen in the following quotation:

> The main problem has been that for anyone like myself--interested in educational television and interested in mass communication--there are simply not enough professional people available to see during the summer. They are away or are on vacation. It seems quite important that when you organize a seminar such as this you can't assess the value of educational television when the schools are closed during July and August. These are the two months not to be touring the States with the idea of carrying out research in educational television. I haven't wasted my time, but we did miss the opportunity to go into the schools. Also, there is a counter-advantage. Where individuals were available, people had the time to give me. They were not under the pressure of programs. On the whole, the disadvantages, however, outweighed the advantages.

Another educational broadcaster made a similar point:

> Though I have talked to people in projects often, I do not talk with the top people. All the big shots are away on vacation. I wanted to see how the school television programs were received, but I couldn't because the schools were not in session. In Washington, some clerk took me around. I could see that I was interfering with them. I would get shunted to other people. They were very nice, but it would be better if we could get to see the right people.

It would seem, then, that inaccessibility of relevant people and facilities was, at least in part, a practical difficulty due to the timing of the trip. The same issue came up at another point, when respondents were asked whether the various places they visited were appropriate and rewarding. The most frequently cited sources of dissatisfaction with some of the places visited were that it was not possible to observe certain facilities or operations because activities were curtailed during the summer (mentioned by six respondents) and that people the participant wanted to see were away on summer vacations (five). This problem, of course, did not affect the educational broadcasters alone. As it happened, however, it constituted a real limitation for them, and apparently none at all for the news broadcasters.

It should be noted that the problem of inaccessibility was not always due to the fact that the relevant people were out of town, but often due to the fact that they were simply too busy to spend much time with the participants. Many participants mentioned how busy the people in the field were, and expressed their own reluctance to intrude upon them. Some respondents did not at all complain about this situation, but accepted it as being in the nature of things. Thus, one respondent, when asked whether he had observed all that he had wanted to in the field, replied as follows:

> Not all--but I don't say this with a feeling of disappointment. You can't stay too long in any one place. You become a nuisance for the people who are showing you around.

A number of participants were so sensitive about taking up too much time that they set their own limits, and did not always return, even when a particular man had indicated willingness to see them again. It seems to us that this kind of problem would be most likely to arise when the situation is structured as the typical courtesy tour for a visitor. We would guess that when a visitor is attached to a facility for a somewhat longer period, and more integrated into its on-going activities, access to the relevant people would present less of a problem.

This leads us to the second major type of criticism of the professional experiences in the field mentioned by the participants. Eleven of the respondents made one or more of the following points: that they saw too many stations and could not stay long enough at any one of them to go into the detail they would have liked; that they saw only the facilities at the stations they visited and not enough of the stations in actual operation; or that they were unable to work at a station even though they would have liked to. (The last point was made by eight respondents, although in another context it was made by nine.) In short, these respondents criticized their professional experience on the trip because it did not provide them enough opportunity for a deeper and more detailed exploration of their professional concerns. The nature of these criticisms can best be illustrated by several quotations. One participant commented:

> . . . I and most of my colleagues have found that during this trip there comes a time when you think: if I have to see one more television station I'll scream. You feel that you just cannot take any more. They are all so much the same. It would be better if there was more specialization in our trips. If, for example, in one place we went to see the station, and in another place we went to be attached for a period of time, and in a third place we went to talk with the management. This would break up some of the monotony.

A participant from the educational field said:

> Everywhere I go I'm shown the facilities. This doesn't interest me because I am not a technical person. I wanted to know about the actual programming, the administration, and the receiving in the schools. . . . I would like mainly to spend two or three weeks in one place so that I could work in one place. . . . I wanted to stay in a place where production was going on.

Finally, another participant, again from the educational field, responded as follows:

> I think our itinerary has been good. It has been so helpful, but I feel that if I could have had more time with one professor or director, then I could go more deeply into the professional side. But these people are very busy. They would see us for one or two hours, but that's all. And then I think our poor English would bother them. We have seen many stations and people. We got the ideas of those people and stations, but for professional study, if we could stay longer at some institutions, universities or stations, it may be more helpful. This is not good for sightseeing, but it is better for professional purposes.

These criticisms are reminiscent of parallel points that were made with regard to the professional seminars. The participants were not entirely satisfied with experiences that consisted largely of being shown facilities, without enough opportunity to see these facilities in operation and to learn more about the actual processes and problems of program production. They tended to feel that this type of experience was too repetitive. They missed the opportunity to go more deeply into some of the procedures, to gain a detailed knowledge of operations, and to focus on specific problems of mutual professional concern. A number of participants expressed the desire to be attached to a single station for a longer period of time, so that they could have closer contact with its actual operations. Some would have been interested in actually working on the staff for a while. Others would have liked to be attached to a producer and observe his activities in detail. In any event, this would have meant visiting fewer stations, but spending a longer time with a deeper involvement in one or more of these. As we have already noted, those participants who had this type of opportunity were highly satisfied with the professional side of their trip.

This type of criticism, again, is made most frequently by the participants in the field of educational broadcasting. It is raised by six out of the ten participants in the educational field, and only one out of the seven in news broadcasting. This is probably related in part to the fact, already discussed, that people and facilities relevant to the interests of educational broadcasters were less accessible during the summer. But there may be another reason why educational broadcasters are particularly prone to raise this type of criticism. It seems that they brought more specific professional goals and expectations to their American visit, and that a more specific type of professional experience was needed to meet their particular requirements. The people in general programming--most of whom were in top administrative positions--had an interest in seeing many facilities, observing their range of activities, and making comparisons between them. The people in the news field, as we have already noted, had some professional interest in almost any information about America: it was all grist for their professional mills. The satisfaction of the educational broadcasters, however, depended to a larger extent on their opportunity to observe detailed operations and to focus on specific problems of direct professional concern.

## Social Activities

The social side of the travel period seemed to work out extremely well. All of the participants indicated that they had an adequate opportunity to meet Americans, and 27 out of the 28 found it easy to get to know the people they met. All of the participants had an opportunity to visit private homes; in fact, eighteen of them mentioned that they had a great deal of opportunity to do so. In general, the level of satisfaction with this aspect of the trip was very high: 23 respondents expressed unqualified satisfaction, while five had mixed reactions.

Hospitality was organized by local agencies in the various cities visited by the participants. Most participants also met many people through arrangements made by the university. In addition, many of the participants made social contacts of their own: fourteen reported that they had themselves arranged many social contacts ahead of time; seventeen were apparently able to establish many new contacts spontaneously.

The organized hospitality was particularly successful. It was singled out for praise by 21 of the respondents. For example, one participant from an Asian country told us:

> In every city, besides the people of the stations and the universities, I had a chance to meet some families. I think that these experiences were very precious for me. People are much more frank and open here than we are in my country, and more so than Europeans. I like Europe, but they are not so open. I visited various families and found those families were very good families.

Another respondent said that he had a great deal of opportunity to meet Americans. He added:

> I have happily accepted hospitality everywhere I went, and I have met it everywhere. My hand is aching from the bread and butter letters that I have been writing.

While the over-all reactions to the organized hospitality were highly favorable, there was some variation in the reactions the participants had to their experiences in different cities. In general, the participants seemed to evaluate the private (non-governmental) hospitality centers somewhat more positively. One factor that seemed to make a difference for some of the participants was the relative "popularity" of a city they visited as a destination for foreign visitors. Thus, one participant, who had rather few contacts of his own and who also had some language difficulty, was particularly grateful that he had been advised to go to Seattle and Portland:

> The people there were very glad to see me and I enjoyed it very much. I don't think that they often have foreign visitors. It was a good idea to go there.

Since it was difficult for this participant to make his own social arrangements, it was probably particularly wise for him to go to communities that are less inundated with foreign visitors and where he was able to receive more personal attention.

A few participants made some general criticisms of the organized hospitality. Occasionally, a participant would feel that too much was planned in a particular community, so that he found his schedule too exhausting. Some mentioned that they would have liked more privacy, or the opportunity to arrange their own schedules. A different type of criticism was raised by one participant who would have liked a wider range of contacts. He mentioned, for example, that he experienced difficulty in meeting American Negroes and wondered why the hospitality committees failed to arrange such meetings.

Only two of the participants gave any indication that they had unpleasant experiences in the course of the hospitality. One felt that his hosts were often patronizing; the other felt that she had to "sing for her supper" by performing as a foreigner. These two types of experiences represent rather common dangers in international contacts, particularly when these are contacts between an American, for example, and an African or an Asian. It is quite easy for people who offer hospitality to become patronizing, to play the benefactor, and to both exploit and offend the visitor by questioning him about his "primitive" country and its quaint customs. What is really encouraging is that only two of our respondents reported such experiences. As a matter of fact, most of the participants reported quite the opposite kind of experiences. They felt that their hosts were genuinely interested in them and they enjoyed the opportunity for frank discussion. Although a few of the participants were a little disturbed at the lack of information about their countries that they encountered, others were rather surprised that the extent of information was so great. Moreover, most of them felt that their hosts were truly interested in learning more. Participants were most likely to come away from their encounters with American families impressed with the openness and frankness that they found.

## Arrangements for the Travel Period

During the interviews in the field, respondents mentioned a number of problems that they had encountered (eleven indicated that they had encountered some serious problems or difficulties) and offered some suggestions for making the travel experience smoother and more convenient in certain respects. While most of the points are obvious, once they are mentioned, it may be worth listing the problems and suggestions that were brought up most frequently. This should help identify areas in which difficulties tend to arise, and details that should be considered in the planning of individual trips.

Itinerary and Schedule. Sixteen participants were not entirely satisfied with all aspects of their itineraries. The most frequent reasons for dissatisfaction were related to the time allotted to various places and to the timing of stops. Thus, five respondents felt that on some stops they did not have enough time for the activities that had been arranged for them; six felt that so many commitments had been arranged for them that they did not have enough time for spontaneous activities. Four respondents mentioned that the schedule did not allow them to use their time to maximal advantage.

In this connection, a number of participants indicated that one-day stops were usually not very valuable. This type of arrangement turned out to be very tiring, and really did not give them enough time to do anything. It was also mentioned that it would be best to avoid scheduling arrival in a new city on the weekend. The weekend is usually a good time for various social activities, but this presupposes earlier arrival so that the necessary arrangements can be made for maximal use of this time.

It should be mentioned here that 22 of the participants made some changes in their itineraries as they went along; eighteen of them reported no difficulty in making these changes. The additional three participants would have liked to make changes but found it impossible.

Financial Details. A number of participants indicated that they were not clear about the exact amoung of their travel allowance and the regulations governing the use of these funds. Since most of the participants were traveling on a tight budget, it was important for them to have precise information on funds available, so that they could guide themselves accordingly. For the same reason, some participants indicated that they would have liked to have exact information on baggage allowance and charges for excess baggage. Eight participants found the per diem allowance inadequate. Some suggested that a special allowance for intra-city transportation would have been helpful.

A different type of problem in the financial area that arose quite frequently (it was raised by ten respondents) was the difficulty in cashing checks. This seemed to be only in part a matter of lacking information about the proper procedures to follow. In many cities, the problem was a lack of facilities where a non-resident could cash a check. Participants suggested that it would be a good idea to make specific arrangements with banks in different cities who would honor the checks, and to provide each individual with a list of these banks.

Transportation. Seventeen respondents found the transportation arrangements adequate, seven found them inadequate, and four gave mixed reactions. More specifically, a number of participants complained about long bus trips, which they found particularly tiring. This was especially true when the bus trip was scheduled at night, or when it took them through dull countryside, so that they could gain no compensatory pleasure from looking out the window. They would have preferred to use a different means of transportation in those cases, even though it would have been more expensive. Some participants mentioned that they would have liked to have information on the use of cars for transportation--e.g., information about the possible values of going by car as compared to other modes of transportation, and the possible arrangements for renting a car. They felt that they might have preferred to do part of the trip by car, if they had had the necessary information ahead of time. It should be noted that a number of participants did go by car for all or at least part of the way.

Accommodations. Twelve respondents found their hotel accommodations adequate, six found them inadequate, and ten gave mixed reactions. In some cases, participants were so dissatisfied with the hotels into which they had been booked that they found it necessary to move elsewhere. Dissatisfaction was sometimes based on the lack of personal comforts, such as private baths or air conditioning (mentioned by six respondents), or on the feeling that the hotel was unattractive and perhaps not quite in keeping with the individual's own status (mentioned or implied by ten respondents). Three individuals were dissatisfied because the locations of some of the hotels were inconvenient, away from the center of town and from the facilities that they were planning to visit. As a result, they could not use their stays to maximum advantage. The implication was clear that these participants, if given a choice, would have selected better and more centrally located hotels, despite the greater expense this would have entailed.

Local Arrangements. Sometimes, a problem arose when participants were not met on arrival in a particular city, despite their expectation to the contrary. They were, thus, not prepared for handling the situation by themselves. This was especially problematic for women. This was the type of problem involved in at least one of the few cases in which an African participant had a really unpleasant personal experience in the South. In describing his visit to a city in the upper South, one African participant related the following incident:

> There I met with your problem of discrimination. . . . At first, the man who was supposed to meet me got a letter stating the wrong time. I was there two hours before he expected to pick me up. So I was not met at the airport. But then I tried to get a taxi into town and I couldn't ride in it because the other people in it were white. So I had to hire a car and that cost me eight dollars in order to get into town. When I got into town they wouldn't let me stay at the hotel. Then I finally found a Negro hotel and went there to spend the night. Then the man who came to pick me up was looking all over for me and he finally found me. They said they were worried about what had happened to me. . . . Then they moved me out to the college and everything went well after that.

Clearly, this was a case in which it was especially important to assure proper coordination, and, at the same time, to give the participant enough information so that he could handle any eventualities that might arise.

Useful Information. Some participants mentioned that they would have appreciated some advance information on cultural activities and other events that were taking place in the cities they were visiting. It would have been useful, not only to be alerted to what was going on before arriving in a city, but also to have tickets for such events. Participants would also have appreciated information about the travel plans of their fellow-participants. Usually, the participants who visited the same city at the same time would meet each other, because they were staying at the same hotel or going to the same television station. Sometimes, however, they did not meet, or met only accidentally after they had both been in town for a few days. They would have appreciated having the itineraries of other participants with information on where they could be reached.

## Recommendations

### A. Recommendations concerning professional activities

Our two major recommendations for maximizing the value of the professional experience during the travel period are continuous with our recommendations for the period of residence at the university.

(1) In general, the plan for the travel period should permit longer visits to a smaller number of places. The visits should be worked out with the understanding that the participant will have an opportunity to be close to the day-to-day operations of the facility and to observe them in detail. If interested, he should be able to take the role of a temporary staff member, participating directly in the on-going activities. Or he may be given access to the facilities and allowed to study daily activities, perhaps by attaching himself to his own professional counterpart in the organization as the latter carries out his regular tasks. Managers of the host facilities should be oriented ahead of time about the interests of their visitors and the nature of the involvement they desire.

It is important to understand clearly the difference between the role of the professional colleague and the role of the sightseer. For certain purposes, of course, the latter may be the most appropriate role for a visitor. If the travel period is to be a meaningful professional experience for the participant, however, then it must provide at least some opportunities for direct involvement around specific professional concerns. These presuppose a sufficiently long and close association with one or more facilities, so that the participant can exchange ideas and experiences with American colleagues on specific common problems, and so that he can gain some detailed information that is directly relevant to his professional activities at home.

(2) In working out the trip for a given participant, it is not enough to include facilities that appear relevant to his interests in his itinerary, nor even to schedule considerable time at these places. It is also necessary to match, as specifically as possible, the kinds of professional experiences that are made available to him with his particular professional needs. In other words, it is important to select facilities that will allow him to carry out those activities and partake of those experiences that he is interested in. Such precise matching is more important to some participants than it is to others. In our study, for example, we have seen that the educational broadcasters seem to have more specific professional needs and thus require more deliberate planning. While it may sometimes be quite difficult to arrange a satisfactory matching, it is important to keep this in mind as a goal to be approximated. The main question to be asked, in arranging the trip, is not so

much what the participant wants to see, but what he wants to do. Professional facilities should be selected and oriented in such a way as to provide each participant with the maximum opportunity to do what he wants to do.

B. Recommendations concerning social activities

(1) Organized hospitality programs seem, in general, to be a very successful feature of the travel period. It would certainly seem worthwhile to maintain this feature, in some form, in future seminars for foreign specialists.

(2) While it is highly desirable to make these opportunities available to the participants, and while there is every indication that they are generally appreciated, one must prevent them from turning into obligations for the participant. On occasion, a participant may find himself involved in a whole set of social activities that were planned for him and that he would rather have avoided, for one reason or another. He may find the schedule too exhausting at this particular juncture of his trip, or he may prefer to have more privacy, or he may want to arrange his own activities. Under such circumstances, it would be unfortunate if the individual found himself caught up in a whirl of activities because others have committed him to them. To some extent, this can be anticipated and prevented through prior planning. It would be a good idea to raise this issue with the participants before they start on their trip, to find out how much of this type of activity they would want and in which cities; in some cities, for example, they may have their own contacts, or they may plan to concentrate on professional activities. Since these problems cannot all be anticipated during the planning phase, however, it is also necessary to sensitize local organizations to the possibility that for some people at some times a heavy social program may be too much. They should be sure to structure the hospitality program as a set of opportunities that they are happy to make available, but that the visitor is not obligated to make use of.

(3) In planning itineraries, it would be well to consider the inclusion of communities that are smaller and less frequented by foreign visitors (provided, of course, that they have something of general as well as of professional interest to offer to the participant). Such communities may be in a better position to give the visitor more personal attention, which would be particularly important for those participants who do not have wide contacts of their own and who for one or another reason (such as language) have difficulty in making their own social arrangements. By the same token, when such individuals visit cities that are inundated by foreign visitors, special attention should be paid to planning their social activities ahead of time, so that they will not find themselves completely isolated.

C. Recommendations concerning arrangements for the travel period

In preparing a cross-country trip for a foreign visitor, it is important to keep in mind some of the practical problems that might arise in the course of such a trip. Problems centering around such items as financial arrangements, transportation, accommodations, and so on, may be peripheral to the basic purpose of the trip. Yet, they may have a decisive effect on the way the person feels about the experience as a whole and how much value he feels he has derived from it.

(1) Whenever one or another type of arrangement for the travel period has to be decided upon, it is important to ask the participant for his preferences--to present him with the alternatives available and allow him to make the choice. One must keep in mind that these decisions usually involve competing values, and there should be no blanket assumption that one value will always predominate for every participant. For example, it is true that most visitors travel on a limited budget and would prefer, wherever possible, to spend as little money as they can. Yet, one cannot assume that everyone would therefore prefer to have the least expensive accommodation available. Some participants might prefer to pay more money and stay at a better hotel because considerations of status, comfort, or convenience happen to be more important to them in this particular case. The same would hold true in selecting the mode of transportation. In this connection, it is valuable to give participants enough general information so as to enhance the range of alternatives of which they become aware. For example, the alternative of traveling by car might not occur to many participants, unless this possibility--together with its advantages and disadvantages--is called to their attention.

(2) In drawing up an itinerary that will meet the needs of the individual participant, it is not enough to give him time in all of the places that he wants to visit. Rather, one must think very specifically in terms of the activities in which he wants to engage. When one adopts that point of view, it soon becomes evident that the problem is more than just setting aside time. For example, a one-day stop may satisfy the requirement of placing a particular city on the itinerary, but it gives the individual very little opportunity to do what he might want to do, unless he has a very specific purpose in making this stop and all of his activities there are arranged in advance.

(3) It is, of course, impossible to avoid all difficulties and inconveniences, such as might arise from the failure to connect with the local contact person. It goes without saying that such difficulties should be avoided wherever possible (and particularly where they might lead to great embarrassment) through proper coordination. It is also important, however, to try to anticipate some of the difficulties that might arise, despite careful planning, and to prepare the visitor for dealing with them. Thus, for example, the experience of the African participant who was not met at the airport as anticipated would have been less unpleasant if this eventuality had been foreseen and he had known how to deal with it. In short, it is better to anticipate difficulties and prepare for them than to deny the possibility of their occurrence.

(4) It is important to consider the various possible ways in which a visitor's experience in a given place can be enriched and to try to make these additional opportunities available to him. Generally, this would involve giving him as much information as

possible (for example, information about on-going activities in the cities he plans to visit, and information about his fellow-participants who will be there at the same time), so that he will have a greater range of choices when he arrives in a particular place. Often, it should also be possible to make facilitative arrangements so that the individual can take advantage of the opportunities that are available.

# CHAPTER 7

# PARTICIPANTS' REACTIONS TO THE SEMINAR AS A WHOLE

Chapters 4 and 6 described the reactions of the participants to the two major phases of their experience while these were in progress, and presented a series of recommendations based on these findings. We now turn to the participants' retrospective reactions to the Seminar as a whole, including its two major phases. These data were obtained at two points, each of which is able to provide a different perspective, instructive in its own right: (1) Immediately prior to the participants' departure from the United States (i.e., the fourth interview) -- thus at a point at which the total experience had come to an end, but was still very fresh in their memories; (2) Some nine months to a year after their return home (i.e., the post-return interview) -- thus at a point at which they had gained some distance from the experience and had an opportunity to assess its impact on their activities in their regular environment. Our purpose in the present chapter is to give a brief overview of these findings in order to see how the total experience appears to the participants in retrospect; to ascertain whether these findings are consistent with the more detailed findings about the university phase and the travel phase, respectively, obtained while these were still in progress; and to examine whether our main conclusions and recommendations need to be changed or qualified in the light of the participants' retrospective reactions.

## Reactions Prior to Departure from the United States

Perceived Goals. Now that the Seminar had reached its conclusion, we asked the participants to review and evaluate the goals that it had hoped to accomplish and to estimate the extent to which the organizers of the Seminar had actually been able to achieve these goals.

Participants recognized three main goals for the Seminar. Most frequently mentioned was the desire to create an understanding of American broadcasting, especially of American television: nineteen participants indicated that the organizers of the Seminar had wanted specialists in other countries to become well acquainted with the accomplishments and the problems of that enterprise. The second major goal again involved a presentation of America to outsiders, this time a presentation of America as a society and as a culture: thirteen participants stated that a major intent had been to provide them with a survey of American philosophical, political, and economic ideas. Only two participants, however, felt that there had been an endeavor to "win friends and influence people" for America. The third major goal perceived by the respondents was of a quite different nature. Eleven participants suggested that a major intent had been simply to provide a context in which an exchange of experiences and ideas between persons who were working in different professional situations would be possible.

Were these goals achieved? Only one participant felt that they had not been achieved at all, and the majority felt that they had been fully achieved. Were the goals satisfactory to the participants? One hears a qualified "yes." Ten participants felt that some goals were more acceptable than others. Several participants suggested that some of the goals were inappropriate for the kind of group that had been gathered together; several suggested that certain goals were unrealistic; several suggested that staff goals were incompatible with participants' goals. Seventeen participants, however, approved fully of the seminar's goals as they perceived them.

In this list of goals, and among the goals suggested by smaller sets of respondents, one logically possible goal is scarcely represented. Only four participants mention that one of the goals of the Seminar was to enable Americans to learn from their colleagues from abroad and to exchange ideas with them. The participants seem to have accepted the tacit understanding that they had been invited to America to learn from Americans about American broadcasting and American institutions, and to exchange ideas with each other, but not to bring knowledge to or exchange ideas with their American counterparts. As we have already suggested in Chapter 4, a Seminar with this kind of goal built explicitly into its structure might make for a professionally more involving experience.

Suggested Changes for the University Phase. What changes would the participants suggest for the program at the university? Did they feel that there were any things of consequence that should have been done differently? In fact, all answered "yes" to the latter question. Their suggested changes refer largely to matters of scheduling, choice of speakers and topics, mode of interaction, and facilities.

There was a common feeling that scheduling had been too intense and that too much time had been spent at the university. Fifteen participants wanted to reduce the university period. Two of them would have shortened the academic seminars; two would have shortened the professional seminars; and eleven would have shortened both sets. Five participants felt that the schedule should be reconstructed so that there was more time for relaxation. There should be time for recreation, there should be time to read the materials that had been distributed, there should be time to go into the city and move about among the people. At an even more concrete level, three participants suggested that there should not have been discussions following the noon meal.

The choice of speakers and topics is inevitably a problem for so mixed a group. Seven participants felt that there should have been fewer professional speakers. Two respondents felt that there had been too much time spent on the single topic of American race relations; others felt that not enough time was spent on certain other topics in which they had a special interest. Some respondents felt that more speakers should represent mass media other than television, or should come from other cultural fields, or that there should be permanent lecturers, or that lecturers should be selected in terms of their capacity to communicate well.

Mode of interaction and participation was a major topic that underlay many suggestions. Six participants asked that opportunities be built into the program for participants to discuss their own experiences, e.g., to compare programs that they had produced and explore some of the problems these have presented. Seven made suggestions that reflected a desire for improved communication, making active participation in discussions more feasible -- for example, that openness on the part of participants be encouraged; that there be small group discussions; that non -English speakers be encouraged to participate; that there be more chances to talk to lecturers. Several other suggestions call for opportunities for more active involvement on the part of participants in practicum-type experiences. Thus, three persons asked that a strong link be built to the educational broadcasting station near the university. As one of them commented, work is more important than lectures. Another said that participants might be asked to produce their own programs as laboratory exercises -- which, incidentally, strikes us as a rather promising idea.

There were a fair number of comments, finally, about facilities. Few respondents went so far as the one who suggested that the participants ought really to be lodged in Boston and only commute to the university. Nevertheless, quite a few participants did suggest that there ought to be opportunities to attend cultural events and to see the Boston area, that there ought to be better transportation facilities. They also would like more radios, television sets, and tape recorders, and better facilities for showing films. They would like better rooms, and a few people would like a more mature administrative staff.

Suggested Changes for the Travel Phase. Suggestions concerning the travel period fall into two blocks. The first includes suggestions that aim at expanding the opportunities for profitable and involving professional activity. Five respondents suggested that the schedule be arranged in such fashion that a participant might spend a considerable amount of time at two or three stations. Eight respondents noted that the visits ought not to come at a time when a number of the logical hosts would be on vacation. A few respondents suggested that work or training opportunities might well be arranged before the travel period is actually begun. Preparations for the participant's arrival at various places ought also to be better worked out, several noted, since at some places he was hardly expected. Finally, twelve respondents recommended that the directorate provide more detailed suggestions as to where participants ought to go and what they ought to see; there should be explicit information, for example, about the educational TV stations that are to be found in each state.

The second block of suggestions concerned travel comfort. Small sets of respondents recommended that better hotels should be provided, that automobile travel be easier to arrange and more commonly employed, that the cashing of checks be facilitated, and that fewer appointments be set up at each step of the tour.

Exchange Among Participants. We have already seen that respondents spontaneously suggested increased opportunities for exchange of ideas and for active participation in discussions for the university phase of the Seminar. Several questions focused specifically on this and related issues.

Half of the respondents felt that the opportunity for exchange of ideas among participants (which many respondents perceived as a major goal for the Seminar) had been sufficient; half felt that they had not been sufficient to improve exchange in future seminars; eleven respondents suggested that participants be given a greater opportunity to address the group and present their own ideas, experiences, and problems. Eight felt that the over-all structure of the program be so designed that discussions among participants have a more integral place in it -- that such discussions, in other words, be more deliberately planned.

Only a quarter of the respondents felt that the Seminar had utilized the individual talents of the various participants to the fullest. Half felt that a moderate degree of utilization had been achieved, and another quarter felt that only a low degree had been achieved. The situation might be improved, they said, by having participants lead discussions on various broadcasting topics, by incorporating individual showings of the participants' own work into the formal program of the Seminar and providing more time for them.

As far as their own potential contributions were concerned, a third of the participants felt that these had not been adequately employed at the university. Most participants felt, however, that during the travel period adequate use of their particular talents had been made. This may help to explain, in part, why eighteen participants considered the travel period to have been more useful to them than the stay at the university. Four others reported that they had gained more at the university, while five respondents said that they had gained about equally during both phases.

General Focus of the Seminar. In general, participants felt that the Seminar had been sufficiently matched to their particular interests. There were a few complaints: that there had been too much educational television; that there had not been enough opportunity to observe the actual utilization of TV programs in school; that material was not covered at a high enough level. Twenty of the participants believed that the organizers had demonstrated an adequate understanding of their particular needs and of the situations in their respective home countries. Fifteen felt that they had been given a reasonably well-balanced picture on most topics; eight felt that there had been some distortion -- for example, in the coverage of the race question.

All but one participant said that a similar Seminar should be held in the future. All but one were satisfied with the current Seminar sponsorship, but ten would have liked to have seen a shift in the geographical base. Ten felt that the same kind of participants should be included in a future Seminar; sixteen called for a change in composition. The latter felt, for example, that it would be desirable to increase specialization (mentioned by nine respondents) or to restrict participation to people with direct experience in broadcasting (four). Nineteen participants felt that there should be changes in the roster of countries included, but this generally turned out to mean that they wanted even more countries placed on the next list.

## Reactions After Returning Home

In their post-return interviews, participants continued to be enthusiastic about the experience as a whole. All 28 said that it had been worthwhile and enjoyable. Only five felt that they had accomplished less than they had hoped to, while seven thought that they had accomplished even more than they had anticipated. Twenty-six respondents had found more aspects of the sojourn satisfying than dissatisfying; another six had found satisfactions and dissatisfactions to be about equal.

Dissatisfactions. When asked what things they wished they had done differently, seven participants told us that they wished they had visited fewer places, and six that they wished they had stayed at a single station for an extended period. Five wished that they had placed more emphasis on professional activities. Others wished that their English had been better, or that they could have traveled longer, or that they could have gone by car, or that they could have met more "average Americans."

Disappointments with conditions outside of one's self focused on a number of different aspects of the sojourn. Six respondents cited poor planning or organization of one or another feature of the Seminar and/or the trip. Five were disappointed at being unable to visit relevant facilities because of summer schedules. Five found some or all of the professional seminars, and three found some or all of the academic seminars disappointing. Other disappointment concerned insufficient opportunity to exchange information between participants, lack of certain technical facilities at the university, and lack of opportunity to work at or affiliate with a broadcasting station.

Three items were cited by five or more people as the least satisfying aspects of the experience. These are: the fatigue induced by an over-filled agenda of travel, attendance at certain seminars or lectures that were least relevant to the participant's own professional interests, and the geographical location of the Seminar.

Satisfactions. What were some of the ways in which the sojourn exceeded the participants' expectations? For seventeen participants, it was by affording them an opportunity to travel throughout the United States. Apparently it had not been possible to anticipate from abroad the impact that such a journey would have. America's continental scope, its incredible variety, and the rugged beauty of its Western lands traditionally exceed the expectations of American travelers as well. Twelve participants were pleased beyond expectation by the opportunity to meet many people. Eight were excited by the opportunities to learn about people from other countries. Others were pleasantly surprised by the hospitality and friendliness of the Americans whom they met, by the opportunities to learn about educational television, and by the opportunities to learn about communications media in America. It is interesting that rather few participants cited professional experiences -- such as those to which the last two items refer -- among the ways in which the sojourn exceeded expectations. Understandably, the places visited and the people met represent the most vivid memories after the passage of a year. There is also the likelihood, however, that for many participants the relatively passive nature of their professional involvement prevented it from becoming a high point of the experience.

What aspects of the experience were most satisfying? Once again, travel is a first choice. Seventeen people cite the travel period as the most satisfying aspect, as against four who cite the period at the university. Nine participants speak of the exchange of ideas with other people, and five speak of the seminars that were particularly relevant to their own special interests. Four speak of visits to broadcasting facilities, and two of the opportunity to work at a station. Eight cite the chance to "travel around the country and meet "average Americans"; six refer to the hospitality and friendliness of the people; and four refer to the chance to see the beauty of the American terrain. Here, professional experiences do take their place side by side with the pleasures of travel and interpersonal encounters, although the latter still predominate.

What parts of the sojourn had they found particularly useful after their return? Twelve nominated the academic seminars in general. Eleven nominated specific seminars and lectures that were related to their particular interests. Nine spoke of the opportunity to observe broadcasting or educational facilities; eight of the professional seminars in general; and eight of the exchange of information and ideas with other participants. Finally, eight respondents simply mentioned the travel period.

Suggested Changes. The participants had many improvements to suggest from their present perspective. Eight mentioned that it would be useful to clarify the aims of the Seminar. Twelve suggested that selection procedures be changed to insure greater homogeneity.

Many comments referred to improvements in the professional part of the Seminar. Thus, six respondents made general statements to that effect. Others were more specific: six called for more opportunities to be attached to a station and work with American counterparts; five asked that more opportunities be provided to observe facilities; five suggested that the timing of the Seminar be worked out so that it is coordinated with the availability of relevant facilities (such as school television). The desire for more active professional participation is reflected in a number of suggestions: five participants proposed that the experience be organized more in the nature of a workshop or a laboratory; five suggested that participants be given the opportunity to form into interest groups or discussion groups; four called for more opportunity for professional exchange among participants.

Other suggestions included an over-all reduction in the length of the Seminar (mentioned by eight respondents); a reduction in the amount of time given to lectures and seminars (nine); and an increase in the amount of time available for rest, for reflection, or for travel (four). Four participants suggested that staff take a more intensive role in working out more individualized travel plans, and four others suggested that the Seminar be held in a different location.

It is interesting that, while six respondents say that they would recommend participation in a similar Seminar to anyone who had the chance to attend, 21 would recommend participation to some people but not to others. There is no consensus about the type of person for whom participation is seen as particularly appropriate. Thus, nine would recommend attendance by specialists in educational broadcasting, but not by general broadcasters; on the other hand, three would recommend attendance by those in general broadcasting but not by those in educational. Five would recommend attendance by working broadcasters (e.g., in production work), in contrast to those in policy or administrative posts, while four would make precisely the opposite recommendation.

## Conclusion

As one reviews these retrospective reactions of the participants, several points stand out.

Regarding the composition of the group, about half of the participants mention, in some fashion, that they would prefer greater homogeneity. Most often this seems to be related to a desire for a more specialized focus to the Seminar. This point did come out in the earlier interviews, although it seems to be stressed a bit more in retrospect. Our recommendation on this point (recommendation A1 in Chapter 4) appears valid in the light of the additional information.

With regard to the university phase of the experience, several points stressed in both retrospective interviews echo points that also emerged sharply in the second interview: (1) It would be desirable to resist the tendency to overschedule the Seminar; the number of lectures and seminars ought to be reduced and more time left for rest, reflection, and individual pursuits (see Chapter 4, recommendations A5 and B2). (2) It may be desirable to reduce the over-all length of the university phase; in the post-return interview, we are particularly likely to hear the suggestion that the Seminar as a whole ought to be shorter -- perhaps because some participants were more cognizant of problems that had arisen during their four months' absence or of the difficulties in catching up after such an extended absence from the office. (3) It may be desirable to center the Seminar in a less isolated setting, or at least it would be necessary to find more adequate means of transportation so that participants would feel less confined and cut off and would be better able to take advantage of the cultural offerings of the large city (see Chapter 4, recommendations B3 and B4).

What really stands out, however, in respondents' reactions to the university phase of the experience, when they discern it in the retrospective interviews, is their desire for a professional experience that would allow for a greater degree of involvement and active participation, and for a fuller utilization of the participants' own talants. Thus, they suggest more opportunities for presentations on the part of participants, in which they can report on their own experiences, discuss their own programs, and the problems associated with them, and get the reactions of other participants based on their own relevant experiences. They suggest more planned discussions among participants, perhaps in the context of specially formed interest groups, in which they can exchange ideas on problems of common concern; these should be incorporated as integral parts of the over-all program. They suggest more opportunities for participants to show samples of their own work, again integrated into the over-all design of the Seminar. Another type of active participation that a number of the participants stress is involvement in practicum-, workshop-, or laboratory-type experiences, perhaps through more intensive affiliation with a local broadcasting facility. All of these points came up in our earlier interviews, but they emerge more clearly and more emphatically when the participants reflect on their experiences in retrospect than they did while the experience was still in progress. Our recommendations regarding opportunities for more active participation (Chapter 4, recommendations A3-7) appear even more valid on the basis of these retrospective reactions than they did before, and deserve to be underlined.

With regard to the travel phase of the experience, respondents stress the importance of working out plans for the professional side of the trip more explicitly so that benefits accruing from these experiences can be maximized. Specifically, this implies more deliberate selection of the facilities to be visited and taking steps to assure that they will be prepared for the visitor when he arrives. Of obvious importance here is to time the trip so that the facilities most relevant to participants' interests will in fact be available; problems had arisen for some of our respondents because of summer vacations. Another point, brought up in both interviews, is the desirability of arranging for more intensive experiences by visiting fewer places, with more time devoted to each. All of the above points echo similar points raised in the interviews conducted in the course of the travel period itself (see Chapter 6, recommendations A1 and A2). One point that was raised in the earlier interview but receives considerably more emphasis in retrospect -- and especially on the post-return interview -- is the desirability of providing more opportunities for affiliation with a broadcasting station; that is, a subgroup of the participants feels that attachment to a facility, involving direct involvement in and detailed observations of its on-going activities would greatly enhance the professional value of the experience. And they seem to feel this more strongly the farther removed in time they are from the experience.

In short, what emerges more sharply out of the retrospective interviews than out of the "in-progress" interviews is the desire for a greater degree of active involvement in professional activities, a greater opportunity for exchange of ideas and experiences with fellow-professionals -- other participants as well as American broadcasters, a greater scope for making personal contributions and utilizing one's own talents. Perhaps it is professional experiences of this sort that stand out in one's memory as time passes, far more than professional experiences of a more passive kind. That is not to say that the latter experiences are not useful; they may be interesting, informative and enriching, and they may leave a lasting impact on the person's fund of knowledge and level of understanding. Certainly, we have every reason to believe that our respondents appreciated what they were able to observe and hear about American broadcasting during their visit; much of it they found useful on returning home, and some they were even able to apply to their own situations. What stands out in their memories, however, are not the professional experiences, but the trip throughout the United States -- the places they were able to see and admire and the people with whom they were able to make genuine human contacts.

# CHAPTER 8

# PERSONAL SIGNIFICANCE OF THE SOJOURN

We have dealt, in the preceding chapters, with the participants' reactions to the way in which the Seminar had been organized and executed. We now begin a series of chapters concerned with the impact of the Seminar on the participants. Chapter 9 deals with its impact on their images of America and American broadcasting. Chapters 10 and 11 present relevant comparisons between participants and controls. In the present chapter we are concerned with the personal significance of the sojourn for the participant, as reported by him in the fourth and in the post-return interviews -- i.e., the two retrospective interviews used in the preceding chapter as well. Did he enjoy the sojourn? Did he feel that he had accomplished something? What aspects of the experience were most meaningful for him? In what way does he see himself as having changed as a result of the experience? These are the kinds of questions to which we shall address ourselves.

Our point of reference in this chapter is the individual participant, rather than the Seminar. What we want to find out is what this experience meant to him. In Chapters 4, 6, and 7 the participants served, in essence, as expert informants about the Seminar. They gave us information relevant to the evaluation of the Seminar that only they, as participants, were able to supply. Now, however, it is the participant himself who is our object of study and whose subjective reactions we wish to explore.

Before turning to some of the specific meanings that the sojourn had for the participants, let us examine their responses to certain general questions about the experience.

The participants were strong in their general approval of the sojourn. At the time of the fourth interview, all but two were positive in their evaluations; at the time of the post-return interview, all 28 said that the trip was both worthwhile and enjoyable. In reporting their experiences in that interview, 22 participants made it apparent that they had found more aspects of the trip satisfying than dissatisfying; the remaining six reported about equal numbers of satisfactions and dissatisfactions.

Had they been able to achieve their original goals? Had they accomplished all that they had hoped to accomplish? Before leaving America, ten participants said that they had achieved all of their original goals, and eleven said that they had achieved most of them. This left five who said they had achieved some of them and only one who felt that he had achieved few. After returning home, there were five who felt that they had accomplished less than they had set out to -- and seven who felt that they had achieved more than they had expected. They felt that these original goals, which they had largely attained, were reasonable and appropriate. Only seven suggested that they would have changed them.

Had the trip created any special problems? Eighteen said that this had not occurred. For seven respondents problems had arisen, usually just because they had been away but sometimes because they had specifically been in America. Thus, several men said they now felt a sense of frustration; they had gained new ideas in America, but could not carry them out. Another man noted that normal problems had simply piled up on his desk while he was away, and another told us that, because of his absence, he had missed the chance to participate in the development of a new program.

As we will show, the experience had been significant in a number of professional and non-professional ways. Yet one wonders: taken as a whole, in which of these two broad ways was it more significant? The answer seems to depend upon the way one phrases the question. The accomplishments that seem most important were those made in professional areas. The experiences that seemed most meaningful or enjoyable were those that fell in non-professional areas. These data can be seen more clearly in the following table:

| | Number of Respondents Citing | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Professional area | Non-professional area | Total N |
| as locus of most meaningful or enjoyable experiences | 11 | 16 | 27 |
| as locus of most important accomplishments | 19 | 8 | 27 |

The most appropriate way to summarize this table is to say that both areas were of considerable importance to the respondent, and the succeeding sections of this chapter will explore them in some detail.

At the end of the sojourn, participants were asked whether they had experienced significant changes in their ways of looking at things. Twenty-one reported altered perspectives about America. Thirteen said that they had acquired a new vision of the potentialities of the mass media. Five said that they had achieved a fuller realization of their communalities with people from other countries. In the post-return interview, twelve participants reported that, directly or indirectly, the trip had led to changes in the plans they had for the future.

According to their own reports, then, the sojourn did have important meanings for many of the participants. Let us turn, then, to some of the more specific ways in which such a trip can have meaning for those who participate in it. In the sections that follow we shall look at the experience in terms of its effects -- from the participant's point of view -- on (1) his professional knowledge, insight, and activities; (2) his knowledge about the profession as practiced in America; (3) his knowledge of America as a whole; (4) his sense of enjoyment in a foreign setting; (5) his orientation to international exchange and contact; and (6) his perspective in his own country.

## Professional Knowledge, Insight, and Activities

A great deal of the effort in arranging the Seminar was devoted, of course, to shaping an experience in which the participant could enlarge his professional competence. We have seen in previous chapters that much of the appreciation and the criticism earned by the Seminar was a function of the perceived opportunities for professional learning. It is not surprising, then, to find that this learning is one of the most significant features of the experience for the participant.

This is shown most clearly in six points, each of which is made by about half of the participants. When asked (in the fourth interview) to list their important accomplishments, fourteen noted that they had increased their over-all professional experience, and eleven noted that they had gained a greater appreciation of the value of educational television. When asked to list initial goals that had been accomplished, fifteen pointed out that they had learned about educational television. When asked to list meaningful or enjoyable experiences, sixteen included the opportunities that they had had to observe local facilities, and eleven referred to their exposure to new program ideas. Finally, thirteen reported in another section of the interview that they had gained new perspectives on the potentialities of the mass media.

There are of course other sections in the interviews in which smaller numbers bring up professional learning as a valued experience. Thus, four men cite their period of work at a station as a highly meaningful experience; five cite those seminars that were related to their professional interests as especially satisfying aspects of the experience. Items such as these are less impressive than the fact that so many cite the benefits listed above.

The extent to which this professional learning can be personally significant is indicated in the remarks of an African who had been asked about his most important accomplishments:

> For me the most important thing is that for the first time I had an introduction to television. All I know up to now about television I learned here. This was new to me and I learned so much. I learned not only what television is, but I learned from experience what television can do. . . . All of this was new to me because I am new in broadcasting.

This kind of response is not limited to those who are new to broadcasting, however. Let us consider the response of a well-established educational broadcaster to the same question:

> I think there was a shift in my attitude to the possible value of straight instructional courses on television at the adult or near adult level. I think now that there is more value to these programs than I thought before. I am also more aware of the potential market of this kind of thing. It is more relevant to my country than I thought before. I have also reinforced my belief that educational television can have a job to do on a small scale. The concept of a university station I find quite

> meaningful and I can see its potential even more. . . .

As we see, for this last man professional learning did not take the form of instruction in the way things might be done, but of stimulating him to think about the implications for the home situation of the activities he saw carried out in the American context.

In the final analysis, of course, the value of professional learnings depends on their relevance to the person's own professional situation and to the performance of his professional role. Do we have any evidence that the participants as a group saw such relevance, as the two cited above clearly did?

In the fourth interview, respondents were asked whether they had gained new perspectives on their professional roles. Thirteen said that they had, and thirteen said that they had not. Again, they were asked whether they had gained new perspectives on the way broadcasting should be run in their own countries. Twelve said they had; fourteen said they had not. Some of the specific new views that they had gained were: that broadcasting should be more dynamic, that it should strive harder to reach more people and to meet their needs better, and that it should place more emphasis on educational activities. Half of the respondents reported that their views on the future of educational television in their own countries had changed; they unanimously saw it as having very important potential. Finally, many participants were strengthened in the view that commercial control of broadcasting may have deleterious effects.

Participants were queried again in the post-return interview about the professional relevance of their experience. Had the sojourn affected their views of broadcasting at home? Only three said that it had not. What kinds of views had been affected? Sixteen said that they now felt that the use of broadcasting media in educational pursuits should be extended. Seven said that they felt more confirmed in the advocacy of public,non-commercial control of the media. Four felt confirmed in their advocacy of an emphasis on radio. Four wanted to extend public service broadcasting. Three wished to emphasize the development of television.

Participants were asked whether their professional activities had been affected by the sojourn. Ten said that there had been a large-scale effect. Fifteen referred to a moderate effect. Three reported no effect. What were some of these effects? For five participants, it was a change in position or responsibility. For 13, it was that they could now contribute to the development of educational television. For sixteen, it was that their own professional skills had been enlarged. For eleven, it was that they could apply specific programs or methods modeled on American broadcasting.

Had they been able to apply specific ideas or procedures acquired in America to their present professional activities? Seven had not tried to. Eight had tried to and had been successful. Four had tried with mixed success; one, without success. Eight had tried and did not yet know how things would work out. The innovations with which they had concerned themselves had included: the extension of instructional educational broadcasting; changes in program style (such as the style of news presentation); the introduction of new types of programs (such as audience participation, quizzes, interviews); changes of a technical nature; and the increased use of international exchange of personnel or programs. These and several other attempts at innovation are shown in detail in Table 8.1.

## Knowledge About the Profession as It is Practiced in America

There were a number of people for whom the significance of the experience lay in part in the opportunity to find out about the way their profession functioned in America. Several interview items are answered in this vein by large numbers of participants. When asked about some of their most meaningful and enjoyable experiences, seventeen participants cited the travel period (which included visits to many professional facilities); eleven specifically cited the observations of local broadcasting facilities that they had been able to make. When asked about their important accomplishments, eleven respondents included the acquisition of greater knowledge about television in America. When asked to list initial goals that had been accomplished, thirteen mentioned that they had learned about the problems that confronted their counterparts in America. Finally, when asked if they had acquired all the knowledge about American broadcasting that they had hoped to acquire, fifteen said "yes" and twelve said that they had attained a reasonable degree of familiarity.

Perhaps we may illustrate these sentiments by referring to the interview of an Asian. He had been asked what experiences he would single out as having been most meaningful to him. He cited the two-months trip, and was asked what in particular was most meaningful about the trip. He replied:

> The tour to educational television stations and to audio-visual facilities and to universities. The excellent instructional material library in Los Angeles. Each station in the country has a unique character; this is very interesting to me. For instance, the educational television station in Seattle is attached to the University. It is trying to extend programs to rural populations. In Albuquerque, the station has the best programs for schools. In San Francisco and New Orleans, there are the best community stations.

This man took back to his home country a highly differentiated picture of the many specific ways in which communications are being employed in America. One may assume that this will be one of his most concrete images. Its anchorage in professional details with which he is especially concerned distinguishes it from the images of America as a nation which concern us next.

## Knowledge of America as a Whole

The evidence that participants attached importance to learning about America is quite conclusive. Asked (in the fourth interview) to list some of their most meaningful or enjoyable experiences, 22 participants spoke of the first-hand exposure to American life, made references to interpersonal experiences with Americans. The importance

Table 8.1

## ATTEMPTS TO APPLY AMERICAN IDEAS AND PROCEDURES IN PARTICIPANTS'OWN BROADCASTING SYSTEMS

| | Number of Participants who devised: | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Innovation | Successful Efforts | Unsuccessful Efforts | Trial Efforts |
| Extension of instructional or educational broadcasting | 4 | 0 | 8 |
| Changes in program style or content | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| Introduction of new types of programs | 3 | 0 | 3 |
| Changes of a technical nature | 3 | 0 | 2 |
| Increased use of international exchange of personnel/programs | 2 | 0 | 1 |
| Introduction of programs specifically modeled after American programs | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Increased use of indigenous personnel or materials | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Allocation of more time and channels for public service programs | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| Introduction of research into audience reactions | 0 | 0 | 1 |

of learning about America is presumably the factor behind the response of six persons who referred to the academic seminars, and is also implicit (along with the desire to learn about the profession in the U.S.) in the response of the seventeen who refer to the travel period in general. Further along in the interview, 21 respondents report that the new perspectives that they have gained include new insights about America, its institutions, and its people. Twenty-four respondents say that the acquisition of first-hand knowledge about America has been one of their original goals that has been accomplished. In the post-return interview, when asked how the trip exceeded expectations, seventeen referred to the opportunity to travel in America and twelve to the opportunity to meet people. Asked about the most satisfying aspects of the trip, seventeen referred to the travel period, and eight to the opportunity to travel and meet average Americans.

One set of data suggests that learning about America may have a rather global meaning for some of the respondents and a more differentiated one for others. When they were asked to cite important accomplishments of the trip, 22 participants gave responses that we have coded as "gaining a greater understanding of the American way of life, of American values." This rather diffuse phrasing seems to have been descriptive of many more interviews than several more concrete and analytic items; thus, only eight respondents spoke of gaining greater knowledge about the institutional structure of America, and only six spoke of gaining greater knowledge about the American educational system. Our point is that, while learning about America was a highly significant aspect of the experience for almost every respondent, the content of the experience that is covered by that phrase may vary greatly from one respondent to another. Several quotations may help to illustrate this point. One respondent describes his most meaningful experiences as follows:

> At first, the insight into American politics, that is, academic seminars at the university and travel around the country and making my own investigations. Second, specifically, the opportunity through the academic seminars to study the Negro problem, particularly in the South.

Next, a European answers the same question about meaningful experiences:

> The American way of life. After a week of being here, I thought I understood many things about America. I had written some letters to directors of journals and magazines. The directors after receiving the letters answered that the letters could be published as short articles. But after four months in America, I am not sure that I understand America. The American society, the American way of life are the things of most importance that I have found. Therefore this question doesn't make any sense. I came here to learn about America and not about television. The most important thing was the whole experience. If you like, I can single out one or two to make you happy, but I don't think it makes any sense. It is the whole four months that is meaningful.

Or, to cite another European:

> I have not had the opportunity /previously/ to get experience about American society by myself. Everything I knew was through literature, music, radio, articles in newspapers. (This is before you came?) Yes. Writers write books in their own way. American movie producers express American life in their own Hollywood way. Our journalists write mostly about economic and political questions. I have some image. But now that I spent four months here, I could see things with my own eyes. Now my image is clearer than before. Having the opportunity to be introduced to your country, I was able to see life more plastical than before -- more sculptured. (In greater detail?) Yes. It's like putting two photos next to each other. You get a three-dimensional image. I tried to see America with American eyes. . . .

Finally, the African whom we previously quoted, who saw learning about television as his most important accomplishment, speaks of his most meaningful experiences in these words:

> My stay at Brandeis before the journey began and my going around the country. Two experiences stand out in my mind: my New Orleans stop and then Washington and Philadelphia too. The first place, New Orleans, this was the first time I came across Negroes. I stayed with a Negro family. I shared their life and studied their problems and thinking, etc. I talked with Urban League people. In Philadelphia, I was impressed by staying with a mixed group -- white and black staying together, trying to understand each other. I stayed at Fellowship House there. It was like New Orleans showed me the problem and Philadelphia showed me one solution to the problem. I enjoyed Washington because of the places I visited and the people I met -- the historical places and the government of the United States, the Senate. (And what was most meaningful at Brandeis?) The introduction to the whole life of America. This was a key experience. I felt as I went around that the stay at Brandeis had opened my eyes to what to see -- the government, the racial problem, etc. It was a very good introduction. Without it one would be in trouble. One wouldn't know what to expect. I think it was very good and well organized.

## Sense of Enjoyment in a Foreign Setting

So far, we have asked what kinds of learning experiences made the trip significant to the participants. Travel, however, is more than a chore and an education. A sojourn in a foreign country is an opportunity to move among new people and to enjoy the savor of new sights. These pleasures are not always available, of course; it may be that one's biases regarding a nation prevent any but formal contacts. It may be that one's personal defensiveness prevents any but uneasy contacts. It may be that one's lack of familiarity with the language or the culture prevent any but superficial contacts.

Fortunately, these problems seem not to have existed for most of our participants. Seventeen said that their most meaningful times included interpersonal experiences with Americans, and eleven cited, in this context, their observations of the physical environment.

The following quotation presents a European's discussion of his most enjoyable experiences:

> The human contacts, I would say. Talking with people. These have ranged from a Negro waiter in a New Orleans restaurant to a producer at a party in Chicago. Then the sheer physical experience of being in certain parts of the U.S. has been enjoyable. Arizona, San Francisco, and Charleston particularly stand out in my mind. Then the exploratory aspects of travel -- finding off-beat places that Americans don't even know about. For example, in Georgetown, Colorado, there is a silver mining town where I went because I have been referred to the local editor of the paper there. . . .

Another European described his most enjoyable experiences as follows:

> Since I am fresh from the trip today, the most enjoyable was the trip, and during the trip there were so many things that were enjoyable. (Can you mention a couple?) Some places in some states were very enjoyable because they were very beautiful. They were tourist attractions to look at beautiful things. I especially remember the trip between San Francisco and San Luis Obispo. We followed the coastline. . . . Then we enjoyed an unexpected meeting with cowboys in Colorado. We talked about Western romance and what is wrong with Westerns today. We stayed with them in their poor house. We met them in a bar in a hotel. They said, "Come up and see what we are doing. We work sixteen hours a day -- it is not so romantic." We went out and rode horses. . . .

## Orientation to International Exchange and Contact

Participation in this instance of international exchange expectably affected attitudes toward exchange programs. The extent to which this occurred is not certain. The impact appeared greater to the participants after they had been home for a year, as shown in the following table:

| | Number Who Say That Their Feelings | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Have not changed | Have become more negative | Have become more positive |
| **Fourth interview:** Have your views about the value of international exchange changed. . . since you have been here? | 18 | 1 | 6 |
| **Post-return interview:** Were your views on the value of international exchanges affected in any way by your experiences in America? | 7 | 2 | 18 |

The difference in these two patterns of response may only reflect a difference in the questions that preceded the ones cited here within each of the interviews. There is, however, a more interesting alternative hypothesis. In both years, most participants may have had positive feelings. In the fourth interview, though, they were still in America and still within the context of an exchange experience. Being favorably disposed to such experiences may then have seemed very natural an attitude and one that they had always held. In the post-return interview, on the other hand, the question was answered after the respondent had been back home for some months, during which he might have become aware that -- at least in a small sense -- he had become different as a result of his experience. Participation in this exchange experience has become an important part of his personal and professional identity, as he moves among those who have not had this experience. This may make the value of exchange programs more salient than it was when he moved among those who shared this claim to distinction, and may make him more aware that he had indeed become more positive in his view.

Participants were asked in the fourth interview to list some of the possible benefits of international exchange. Eight pointed out that it could promote international understanding; seven, that it led to mutually beneficial exchange of professional information; and one, that it led to the formation of personal friendships.

They were then asked what their own potential contributions to exchange might be. Thirteen said that it would lie in professional areas; eight, in non-professional areas. More specifically, eight said that they could communicate their own professional knowledge; three said that they could use their position to promote exchange; three, that they could take a personal interest in foreign visitors; four, that they could present documentaries about their own countries.

Participants were also asked, more generally, about the effect of their experience on the professional and personal contacts that they had made. On the professional side, 22 participants reported in the post-return interview that they had established contacts with American individuals or organizations while in America; of these, seven reported establishing many such contacts. The greatest number of these contacts were with American networks; others were with foundations, universities, and Seminar personnel. They were also asked whether they had been able to make professional contacts with persons from countries other than America. Three had made many such contacts, and ten had made some. Most of these contacts were with other Seminar participants.

How important were the professional and personal contacts to the participants? Twelve of them list, among their important accomplishments, the establishment of relations with fellow professionals; six list the opening of relations with people outside of their profession. Seven list as one of their most meaningful and enjoyable experiences the establishment of contact with fellow participants in the Seminar. Five mention at another point, as we have already noted, that they had come to realize more fully their communalities with people from other countries and to experience greater ease in interacting with them.

Before departure, most participants said that they were going to try to keep up their contacts with the Americans whom they had met and with the other Seminar participants. Their success in this endeavor was checked in the post-return interview. They seem to have done surprisingly well at keeping in touch with Americans, if not with their fellow-participants. Ten have kept up relatively intense relations with Americans -- for example, by exchanging long letters. All the others, except one, have at least exchanged Christmas cards. Contact with other participants has been less sustained. Three have kept up some sort of intense relation. Thirteen have maintained perfunctory communications; and ten, none at all.

## Perspective on Home Country

It is, of course, traditional lore that one never appreciates home until he leaves it, and that foreign travel is the best way to learn to see one's own country. Our participants behave in accord with this lore. All but four acknowledged in the fourth interview that they had gained a new perspective on the home country; all but two made this acknowledgment in the post-return interview.

One may ask what things they have learned to appreciate more, and what things less. What is deplored tends to be conservatism, bureaucracy, and lack of adventurousness, for the more Western nations; and ignorance, the slow pace of expansion in education, and inadequate enthusiasm for work, for the less developed states. What is appreciated more tends to be the commonly accepted distinctive good features of the various national cultures. Thus, there are references to the fine social welfare systems of some of the more advanced states; patterns of interpersonal relations that are closer than in America, where "a man is not lost in society, [and] people will listen to him"; to the more easygoing way of life of the traditional culture; to the greater capacity of a people to laugh at themselves; to the potential that some states have for future development.

When asked whether he has gained a new perspective on his home country, one European participant, for example, replies:

> Oh yes. That most markedly. . . It has made me realize what is good in my country -- socialized medicine, government intervention, the traditions of my country. These are on the positive side. The architecture, the historical events, also as a nation -- its strength in all that -- how mature it is in a slightly old-fashioned way. Old in relation to America. The defects are that they are very slow in accepting new ideas, new thoughts; they do not jump into things. It's tempered by caution. By sitting on a fence. It is not too bad. It needs to be more adventurous. . . . This is the first time I have been such a long time away from it. It is very important. It has given me a broader perspective. It has broadened me, too.

And an African says, in response to the same question:

> . . . I wish that we had more facilities. It has only shown me how much is to be done in my country, not only in communications but in many fields, and what a short time there is to do it in. . . . I think I like our way of life better. Life in America is dull and people try artifically to make it exciting. (Is there anything about your country that you now appreciate less than you used to?) Ignorance. . . ignorance is all around. I think it is more magnified now because I am so determined to play a bigger part in it by trying to do something about it. I feel it more now than before.

## CHAPTER 9

## PARTICIPANTS' VIEWS OF AMERICA AND OF AMERICAN BROADCASTING

We now turn to the participants' views of America and American broadcasting, as these are revealed in the various interviews. We shall draw especially on their responses to the third interview, which was carried out during the travel period and probed into this area in some detail; and their responses to the post-return interview, which gives us some indication of participants' attitudes at a point at which they have already gained some distance from their experience in the United States.

We must keep in mind that the participants were hardly uninformed about America at the time of their arrival. Nine had visited the United States on a previous occasion. Seventeen told us, in the first interview, that they had close American friends. All but six of the participants had had occasion to inform themselves--for professional or other reasons--about America before this visit; of these, fourteen felt that they were quite well-informed. There were only four participants who reported little previous contact with Americans. Thus, the participants' experiences on this visit are by no means their first encounter with America, and one can certainly not assume that the views they express are entirely a product of these experiences. This trip did, however, represent their longest and fullest exposure to America and its mass media, and it is interesting to see what attitudes they express while they are in the midst of this intensive contact and after they have gone through it. We shall see in the next two chapters that this exposure did, in fact, produce changes in their attitudes. For the moment we shall examine only what these attitudes are.

### Views of American Broadcasters

We shall start our review with the participants' views of American broadcasters. They met quite a few broadcasters during the first phase of their sojourn, including those who came to the university to give lectures and demonstrations, and those who staffed the various broadcasting facilities they visited. The number and range of broadcasters whom they met, however, was greatly extended during the travel period. In particular, they had the opportunity to meet men in small local stations, both commercial and educational--a type of broadcaster with whom they had relatively little contact at the university.

The participants reported in the third interview that they had been able to establish close contacts with American broadcasters. Thus, sixteen indicated that they had a relatively close social relationship with at least some of their professional counterparts--for example, that they had been guests at their houses. The professional relationship had been sufficiently deep, for most participants, to have acquired a good deal of understanding for the problems, activities, and interests of American broadcasters. Most of them indicated that they now feel closer to their American counterparts than they did before.

Their general feeling is that American broadcasters are similar to the ones in their own countries. Many participants echo the words of this respondent:

> I think people who work in broadcasting are the same the whole world over. I found this to be the case. American ones aren't very different. There is a great sort of masonry among broadcasters. They talk the same language, they have the same interests.

Or, to quote another respondent, from an African country:

> Well, we are friendly to each other. Broadcasting is a sort of fraternity. We call each other by our first names. . . . The differences . . . are not very much.

Nevertheless, some participants do point to differences, often in the facilities and financial means available to the two groups, and sometimes in their relative competence. Thus, according to one respondent, American broadcasters

> . . . . are very professional, with lots of experience, very skillful and capable. This is more so than in my country. Even the technical people are very intelligent. One can rely on them to handle everything, including the cutting, the lights, etc. This takes much time and experience. . . . You have more means, more facilities and money. We must keep many people because of the union and complicated problems. An American broadcaster thinks he can be fired tomorrow if he's not good. Ours is very different.

The participants' evaluation of American broadcasters was largely favorable, though not outstandingly so. Our coders inferred, from the respondents' remarks, that nineteen out of the twenty-eight participants judged American broadcasters to be "fairly good," that six felt they "compared favorably with the best broadcasters in the world," and that three regarded them as "rather mediocre." A major source of criticism of American broadcasters was the feeling that they did not meet their responsibilities to their audiences adequately, usually because of commercial considerations and pressures from sponsors. Twenty respondents brought up some criticism in this area, even though most of them felt (in response to a direct question) that, in general, American broadcasters were meeting their responsibilities fairly well. Two examples will suffice:

> To the extent that they put out some first-class news programs and documentaries and other types of public affairs programs, they are meeting part of their responsibilities, but the proportion of these programs is not very high to give broadcasting any cause for satisfaction. There is too much emphasis on programs to find a ready sponsor.

> I think that in the matter of technique their sense of responsibility to their work assignment is very good. They are all quite responsible to their employers. But their sense of responsibility to the audience is another question. They say that they don't like the way American television

> is being run. All of them condemn it--yet they go on doing it. I say, why not change it? When you press that point they come at you with the most disarming, discouraging, exasperating statements. They say, of course, the shareholders must have their dividend.

Some respondents pointed out that, given the pressures under which they work, American broadcasters are meeting their responsibilities fairly well. Many made distinctions between different groups of broadcasters, pointing out that there is less commercial influence among broadcasters in the large networks as compared to those in local stations, among news broadcasters as compared to the "producers who are closer to sponsors," among the men in production as compared to those in management, among the staff of educational stations as compared to those in commercial stations. One participant responded quite sharply to the question about responsibilities cited above:

> What responsibilities? They don't think they have any. Their responsibility is to their sponsors and to the people who pay them. It is only in educational TV that you find people with a sense of responsibility to their audiences.

Another participant stressed a different distinction:

> On the whole I would say that American broadcasters are a nice breed of people. They are intelligent and they feel their responsibilities. The broadcasters are fine. But when it comes to management you don't feel that you are speaking the same language. The producers and program managers--we speak the same language. But the station managers might well be managers of banks. They might well be managers of any commercial enterprise. The professionals are different. You could switch places with them.

Twenty participants felt that the conditions under which American broadcasters work, while sometimes very good, are also sometimes poor. The reasons most frequently cited for poor conditions were excessive constraints by the pressure of advertisers (thirteen cases) and the insufficiency of government control in the interest of public welfare (eight cases). Thus, again, criticisms focused on the commercial control of broadcasting and the feeling that it leads, on the one hand, to insufficient freedom to produce controversial and high-quality programs, and on the other hand, to too much freedom to ignore the public interest.

Further information about participants' views of American broadcasters was obtained in the post-return interview. Evaluations of American broadcasters were still high, perhaps higher than in the earlier interview. In eighteen cases, they impressed the coders as being more favorable than unfavorable, in seven about equally favorable and unfavorable, and in only one more unfavorable than favorable. Favorable points cited most frequently included the high degree of technical skill and competence of American broadcasters (nineteen cases) and their enthusiasm, interest, and industriousness (thirteen cases). On the negative side, the limited effectiveness of educational broadcasters, due to their poorer conditions, was often cited. Thus, one participant replied to a question about the professional competence of broadcasters in the following words:

> Their competence is enormously high everywhere. The technical people are absolutely out of this world--unbelievable, first-rate. The program people and production staff too: the competence is enormously high. They are really good at their jobs. Competition is high and the best person gets the job. Another thing that was very nice is that all the ones I met--both in educational and in commercial broadcasting--seemed to love their jobs; they liked what they were doing. (What about their working conditions?) Most of them work hard. Aside from that, the working conditions are very good in commercial stations, but bad in educational stations. They have to improvise a lot. It's encouraging that they get things done under these conditions, but the things they do are not always good. (What about their opportunities for rewards and advancement?) Again, they are completely different in the commercial and educational field. In the commercial field it can be enormous. In the educational field, most of the people are idealists. They are not starving, but you can't compare it to the bigger commercial outfits.

The distinction between commercial and educational stations is, of course, a frequent feature of the responses we obtained.

Many respondents, as in the third interview, described the conditions under which American broadcasters work in mixed terms. On the one hand, they indicated that American broadcasters had good opportunities for rewards and advancement and were able to work under favorable financial and technical conditions. On the other hand, they felt that the competitiveness and fast pace of work in American TV and/or the commercial element created excessive pressures for the broadcaster. As a result, despite his very high level of competence, the quality of his work sometimes suffered. The following two quotations illustrate participants' views about the pressures stemming from the competitive atmosphere in American TV. Their similarity is particularly striking since the two respondents came from extremely different parts of the world and broadcasting systems:

> I was very impressed with /American broadcasters/ as professional workers: they are very clever professionally. And they work very hard--harder than in our country. It is of course a hard competition in the U.S., and they have had TV for many years. The people working in it are the best ones in the world. On the other hand, they are not always working with the best materials. If they had better scripts, the results would be even better. But as professional producers, directors, photographers--they are excellent. And they work so hard--we were surprised. They are higher paid than we are in our country. On the average they work harder than we do--more hours. I am speaking of the program people, not the technical people.

> I don't know about them, but they have unions with strict rules. The program people work on a hard tempo. They don't have good time to make their programs--to prepare them, rehearse them. . . . It must be difficult to reach the top. You have to be very clever. There is a hard competition and only people with nerves succeed.

> What I saw of American broadcasters--my impression was that they were very hard-working people. So much was expected of them that I wondered whether they had time to polish their work well before it was broadcast. For example, at one station, one man was doing two programs each day, seven days a week. I can't understand how anyone can be creative with such a schedule. As a result, I was not impressed with some of his productions and I didn't blame him for it. In cases where people have the time to devote to their work, they produce marvelous programs. (What about their professional competence?) They are very good. I was highly impressed. (What about their opportunities for rewards and advancement?) Very good too.

The following two quotations illustrate participants' views about the pressures stemming from the commercial element in American broadcasting:

> At the program level, I found /American broadcasters/ efficient and enthusiastic--which is all you would ask. At the executive level I must compare them unfavorably with our broadcasting executives--not because they wouldn't like to indulge their sense of dedication, but because they can't, due to the profit motive which rules the industry. I found a lot of people who were disgusted with it. The program people have a real sense of dedication which is in sharp contrast with the profit-oriented society in which they must operate.

> Americans in general, right from the start of my experience in the States, impressed me with their efficiency and well-organized ways of working. The same is true of broadcasters. They work hard and efficiently. . . . They are very competent. It is a pity that the conditions under which they work--working merely for selling products--don't give them much chance for really creative work, in a permanent sense--creating things that will have some permanent artistic value. (What about their opportunities for rewards and advancement?) I would say they are very good for the good broadcasters.

In sum, it appears that most participants have a sense of colleagueship and of identity in interests and values vis-a-vis their American counterparts. They have generally high regard for them, and certainly evaluate them more favorably than unfavorably. They do have criticisms, particularly about the way in which American broadcasters meet their responsibilities toward their audiences. They tend to ascribe the shortcomings of their American colleagues in this area to the conditions under which they work which, in turn, are related to the structure of American broadcasting. Let us turn, therefore, to the participants views of American broadcasting itself.

## Views of American Broadcasting

On the basis of participants responses to a number of questions in the third interview, our coders concluded that the vast majority (25 out of the 28) had a mixed opinion of American TV--that they were favorably impressed by some aspects of it, and unfavorably by others. Among the features that impressed many respondents favorably were the quality of some of the educational television programs, the documentaries and experimental programs produced by the major networks, and the quality of the technical equipment used. Features that they found particularly problematic or disappointing were the lack of balance in programming--for example, the limited commitment to educational programs relative to commercial ones; the inadequacy of funds available for educational television; the surprisingly poor technical facilities with which some stations--the small local stations, especially in the educational field--had to work; and the unexpectedly low quality of some news programs and the tendency to interrupt these by editorializing and commercials. It seems that the participants perceived the major successes of American TV in the high quality of some of its outstanding products, and the major problems of American TV in the tendency to invest only a small proportion of its resources in these high-quality products. Thus, American TV has proven its potential for quality programming, but is not set up so as to maximize this potential.

Almost all participants felt that most American broadcasters were aware of the major problems of American television, but were not doing much to solve them. Eleven of the respondents indicated that the situation called for a greater degree of government regulation of broadcasting in the public interest. A number of others pointed to the need for creating higher standards of program quality, but only a few mentioned mechanisms for achieving this end. These included pressure by local publics or by broadcasters, self-policing by networks, or increased selectivity of financial support by foundations or government.

Clearly, many participants felt that private ownership was at least an important source of the major problems experienced by American television. Thus, 24 of the 28 respondents indicated that commercial considerations interfered with the development of high-quality programming. They do so, in the eyes of the respondents, both by frustrating efforts to improve the general level of public taste, and by leading to a neglect of specialized audiences interested in high-quality programs. Again, 24 respondents perceived a basic conflict between the requirement of making a profit and the provision of public service.

Nevertheless, the participants were by no means entirely negative in their evaluation of private ownership of broadcasting facilities. Some did express themselves quite negatively, as in the following remark:

> I think that broadcasting power and influence are too profound to be in the hands of private business. The development of Telestar reinforces my view that this is not good.

Only ten participants, however, saw no advantage in private ownership at all; six felt that it had some advantage for America though not for their own countries; and another ten saw some advantages in private ownership in general. The advantages mentioned most often were that private ownership makes for competition between stations, and that it provides greater freedom in choosing and organizing programs. For example:

> One basic advantage of private ownership is this: a higher degree of freedom in organizing the programs. Another advantage is supplied by the competition existing between the various networks.

> When they are privately owned they have competition among the networks. I think that that is good. . . . I think that privately owned makes for more freedom than the public organization. They can have a variety of opinions. . . . In our country, we always have to be very careful to be in the middle, so that we have criticisms from both the right and left wing. Here you can express the greatest variety of opinion. But we need not worry about private finances. Here you are always worried. We collect money each month from our audiences.

> Viewers have the opportunity to choose and I think that is very good. In my country we have only one company. . . . I think it is a good idea to have competition, but the basic problem remains--how to have good quality.

Private ownership does not imply complete absence of controls. Some respondents pointed to the existence of the FCC and indicated that it should be given more power or encouraged to use more effectively the power it already has. One respondent, who saw some advantages in private ownership of the media, added:

> Even though they are privately owned, there should be some controls. Not necessarily government controls. The problem of giving people what they want to see should be changed to giving people what they should see, not what they want to see.

Another source of data on the participants' views of American broadcasting are their answers to a question about the applicability of the approaches of American broadcasting to the situations in their own countries. The majority felt that American approaches had some--but only some--applicability to their own situations. In particular, they felt that the manner of handling public affairs programs and some of the features of educational television could be profitably adopted. Here are several answers to the question about the extent to which American approaches are applicable:

> Very little extent as far as commercial broadcasting is concerned. . . . We can learn a lot from your educational broadcasting. . . . Certain of the program ideas I have picked up. In the field of language teaching I have learned quite a bit.

> In vast areas of broadcasting, [they are] not applicable at all. . . . The main areas of overlap with our system are the cultural affairs and educational broadcasting. . . . The use of TV for direct instruction. . . we will have something to learn from the U.S. in this field.
>
> In general, I don't think so very much. . . . There are some . . . how they do news and documentaries.

Reasons given for lack of applicability, or limited applicability, were the differences in structure and financing of broadcasting in the two countries; the low quality of American programs; and the lack of requisite experience or facilities for using certain American approaches in the home country.

Participants were also asked about features of American broadcasting that they feel should be avoided in their own countries. About half of them mentioned commercials in general and the interruption of news programs by commercials in particular. In answer to a related question, more than half of the participants thought that America could profitably adopt some of the features of broadcasting as practiced in their own countries. Most frequently mentioned were the limited role of advertising, and the use of radio for high-level public service and educational programs.

With regard to radio, almost all participants felt that it functioned differently in their own countries than it did in America. Seventeen noted that in America radio played a rather insignificant role. For example:

> People seem to listen to it only in cars. They listen only to pop records and news. That is the cheapest way to use radio.
>
> You have only music and advertisements and a bit of news and baseball. Radio can do so much more than that. . . . You should have more talks on radio about other people.
>
> It is a pity that radio is dead here. There are certain things it could do but doesn't . . . . They should bring more real programs, talks, discussion, etc. One could get tired of watching TV. Discussions on radio could be as interesting as television.
>
> I think it is not considered to be as up-to-date as TV is. Everybody goes out for TV. If you have extra money, you can buy a radio and put it in the kitchen. I noticed that radio plays a big part in cars where TV couldn't be.

In their own countries, most participants felt that radio would and should remain an important force in its own right. They mentioned, among the many advantages of radio, that it is more economical to produce, transmit, and receive radio programs; and that the equipment, staffing, production, and programming required by radio are simpler and more flexible. In many countries, radio will be needed for some time to reach large segments of the nation; in others, certain cultural and informational programs can be produced more cheaply and at least as effectively on radio as on television.

In sum, participants seem to be impressed with the potential for high quality programming in the United States and with some of the products that have been achieved, but they feel that the structure of broadcasting is not set up so as to maximize this potential. They are critical of the limited allocation of resources for such high quality programming relative to more strictly commercial pursuits. They see commercial considerations as a major source of the problem, although they can also point to certain advantages of private ownership of broadcasting media, particularly within the context of American society. Regardless of the nature of ownership, greater control of programming to insure quality and protect the public interest is needed, and American broadcasters have not sufficiently addressed themselves to this issue. The differences in broadcasting structure and the low quality of some of the American products limit the applicability of American approaches to the participants' own countries, but some of the creative ideas--particularly in educational and public affairs broadcasting--are clearly of value to them. Certain features of American broadcasting--such as the extensive use of commercials and the low repute of radio--should be systematically avoided. In fact, in these areas it would be best for American broadcasters to learn from their counterparts abroad.

## Views of America and Americans in General

Interviews held during the travel period revealed that most participants had developed favorable, if complex, evaluations of America and Americans. Thus, for example, on the basis of a number of questions, our coders judged the opinions of Americans held by the participants to be generally favorable in 23 out of the 28 cases. For 15 of the 23, however, they noted that--while generally favorable--they were critical in some specific respects. The major disappointment about America mentioned most frequently was America's handling of the Negro problem. Features of America that were most often mentioned in answer to the question, "What has pleased you most?" were the democratic atmosphere of America (e.g., the general openness and tolerance for differences of opinion), the sociability of Americans (e.g., their informality and ease of making friends), and the beauty of the country.

Most of the new insights that participants had gained during the travel period tended to concern either qualities of the American people or the institutional structure of America (i.e., its political and economic system). A number of participants reported that they had gained a better understanding of the underlying character and philosophy of America as a country. Others spoke of their increased understanding of the importance of diversity and variety in America--of the role, for example, that regional differences play.

Several questions specifically addressed themselves to various differences within American society, since we were interested in finding out to what extent participants had become aware and knowledgeable about such differences. In reply to some of these questions, 20 of the 28 respondents mentioned some regional differences that had struck them during their travels; of these 15 reported that these differences represented new discoveries for them, rather than mere confirmations of things they had already known. Among the differences most frequently mentioned were differences in social customs (e.g., in the role of tradition in Boston as compared to Chicago); in the tempo of life (e.g., the less hurried and business-like approach to life on the West Coast as compared to the East Coast); in the ease of making acquaintances; and in the climate. Fifteen respondents felt that such regional differences played an important role in American society, having an impact primarily on domestic policy. Other differences within the American population that some participants spontaneously cited as being important to an understanding of American society included racial and ethnic differences (mentioned by nine respondents), socio-economic differences (five), and religious differences (three). In response to direct questions, 14 respondents felt that religious differences play an important role in American society, 23 felt that racial and ethnic differences play an important role, and 14 that socio-economic differences play such a role. Eighteen respondents indicated that these various differences--especially on the racial-ethnic and socio-economic dimensions--are related to the way in which broadcasting has developed in America.

In sum, the field interview reveals a favorable, though not wholly uncritical, attitude toward America and Americans, and an increased awareness and understanding of the complexity and diversity of American society. Let us turn now to the post-return interview, to examine participants' views of America after they had been back home for some months.

One source of information about participants' views of America was a pair of questions in which they were asked to think back to their visit and describe those expectations about America and Americans that were strongly confirmed by their own experiences, and those that were disconfirmed. Sixteen of the respondents mentioned more confirmations than disconfirmations; eight mentioned about an equal number of each. It is interesting to read some examples of expectations that had been confirmed, since they reveal some of the salient impressions of America and Americans that these visitors carried away with them. The following three quotations are taken from interviews with European participants:

> I expected to come to a country in which it was very easy to live and easy to be together with people and talk to people--an unconventional country. And that was true. It was very easy to talk to people. They were very frank. You could criticize America as much as you wanted and they didn't kill you. It was easy to reach people, to talk to them. It was a kind of informality that became formal. . . .
>
> First, that America is not a country but a continent. I expected it, but it was really emphasized. Secondly, the warmth of Americans. That didn't vary anywhere--here one can really talk about them as a nation. The tempo of life--certainly in the cities--was as hectic as I expected it to be.
>
> Their go-getting nature and their capacity for quick action to meet a situation was confirmed. Their variety

> was certainly confirmed. . . . Their tremendous openness and affability--that was certainly confirmed. What impressions I formed of American political life were confirmed. . . . There is greater concern and involvement than one finds here, coupled also with greater cynicism. . . . The capacity for ruthlessness in the course of innovation, of "progress," strikes one more forcefully when one is there. . . .

The next two quotations come from interviews with Africans:

> The general friendliness of the people. The high level of development of the economy and public services. A much more efficient organization of activity. These are all things that one associated with an industrial society.

> That Americans generally have much more than we have in this country, and perhaps in many other countries. They have the basic necessities which many people in this country lack. That America is a highly developed country, a technical civilization. That Americans were friendly, and much more informal in their intercourse with other people, with strangers.

Of even greater interest than the confirmations are the disconfirmations, for they point to what we can presume to be new discoveries and new learnings that were derived from the visitors' first-hand exposure to American life. First, let us look at two responses by African participants when asked about expectations that had been disconfirmed:

> The general belief that every American is a millionaire. Because people here have contacts with rich businessmen, officials and politicians.

> The Hollywood glamorous type of life. Especially when I went to L.A. and found that it was just like any other big city. . . . I was expecting big mansions, but they had just ordinary dwellings.

Next, we turn to some quotations by participants of European origin (though some of them reside outside of Europe):

> The country was more beautiful than I had expected. On balance, I did not find that the much-flaunted American efficiency was quite as efficient as I had expected it to be. . . . Despite the tempo, the end result was not as efficient as people overseas would picture it. I suspect that in part this comes from the social pattern in America where people are reticent to stand forth as leaders. In many instances, there were people who I think would have taken over, but they didn't step forward because it countervenes the social norms. People were reluctant to take leadership. The herd instinct was much stronger than I expected. I was surprised that privacy was not respected anywhere in the United

> States. The attempt to destroy privacy rather than encourage it--for example, hedges between houses in the suburbs are cut down rather than allowed to grow. I felt anyone who let it grow would be regarded as an outcast. I did not anticipate finding this at all. I was shocked more than anything by the American undertaking business. I heard about it but never thought it was operated on this scale. It struck me that here in particular was the herd instinct. People wouldn't stand up against this pattern even though they don't like it. It indicates a sort of subservience to customs which I hadn't expected to find--a lack of independence of thought. I found that very surprising.
>
> I had expected the American way of life to be quite uniform. What was disconfirmed is that there isn't just one American way of life. The variety is so great. You can find your own group. You can find a framework in which you don't have to conform. There is conformism of course, living like the Joneses--but it's not half as bad as I had expected it to be. . . .
>
> The notion that they are always in a rush, tearing from A to B, was not confirmed. . . . Their capacity for self-criticism was to some extent rather unexpected--criticisms of their own institutions, way of life, and so on. . . . The physical beauty of the country, the landscape was much greater than I had been led to expect. I was surprised by some of the implications of the cult of youth. . . . The notion that Americans were always efficient received a crude shock--including, I must say, at the Seminar. One other thing I wasn't quite prepared for is the amount of wastefulness in America. . . .

Some observations clearly come up repeatedly, but there are also some interesting differences in the impressions of different respondents. Thus, one of the three participants cited above was surprised by the high degree of conformity in America, the other by the fact that conformism was not as bad as expected. Both, of course, may be right, since their initial expectations may have differed, and since one was focusing on a general pattern and the other on possible deviations from such a pattern. One man's disconfirmation may also be another man's confirmation, as can be seen in the differing assessments of the pace and tempo of American life.

Another pair of questions on the post-return interview provides further information about the participants' views of America and Americans, as well as about their evaluations of these objects: "What has disappointed you most about America and Americans?" and "What has pleased you most about America and Americans?" The participants' generally favorable evaluation is evidenced by our coders' judgment that 25 out of the 28 respondents had found more things about America and its people to be pleasing than to be disappointing. The remaining 3 mentioned pleasing and disappointing features in about equal proportion.

The most frequently mentioned features of America and Americans that impressed participants favorably included the high living standards and technological advances of America; the generosity and hospitality of Americans; and the friendliness and informality of Americans. A smaller number of respondents mentioned the ability of Americans to voice opposition and to criticize themselves and their institutions; and the physical beauty of the country. Several more idiosyncratic responses are of special interest. Thus, one African participant said:

> What has impressed me was the fact that throughout the country people regretted, resented, and even actively fought against [segregation].

Two participants commented as follows:

> The most exhilarating thing [about Americans] is their tremendous optimism. The easiest way to think of this is to ask what one tended to think of one's self in America. I often thought of myself as a real cynic, which I was in America. At times, of course, this optimism is slightly irritating. One feels its foundation is unjustified.
>
> I was pleased by the vastness, the wide openness, the variations both in climate and scenery and in people. The incredible efficiency in communication, for example, the airlines -- efficiency coupled with the simplicity with which they are run. Enormous technical efficiency, The vitality of the entertainment world -- absolutely unique in the world. These things delighted me. . . .

Finally, one respondent, after mentioning some positive features of America and Americans, added the following remark:

> In the 1960's, for a person who is fairly progressive to become convinced that America is really a nice country and the people are nice is something very important. It makes a big difference. You have something to lean upon. It is terribly important for you to be able to like America, to feel that it is a country in which you can believe. There is not this feeling of hopelessness.

The most frequently mentioned disappointment in America concerned the extent and severity of the racial problem. Thus, the African quoted above, who was impressed with the struggle against segregation in America, also stated that what disappointed him most was "The fact that these racial troubles exist." Another African critized Americans for

> . . . their failure to extend health service to those of its citizens who are not wealthy or self-sufficient. Their failure to achieve a solution to their racial problems.

A smaller number express disappointment in the inefficiency and poor organization that they have encountered; and in the emphasis on material values. With respect to the last point, one respondent expresses his:

> . . . disappointment in the American record in the field of art in general -- art, in any serious form. . . . Then, my overall impression of America -- I feel something does not satisfy me, but I haven't been able to put it into words. There is something lacking -- a sort of basic human essential or element that has been lost, maybe because of automation, the mechanized way of life, maybe living away from nature. Nature has its way of taking its revenge, redressing what it loses. There is a dry pragmatism that you meet with all the time. . . .

The majority of participants had presented one or more programs about America after their return. Their orientation seemed to be one of broadening their listeners' perspective about America, rather than attempting to support either a negative or a positive view of America. The kinds of information that they had presented -- or were planning or expecting to present in future programs -- dealt with the country (its size, variety, and landscape); with places and personalities of special (historical or touristic) interest; with the racial situation; with social and economic institutions; and with the lives of average Americans. The major themes of their presentations had been -- or are likely to be -- the diversity and heterogeneity of America; the complexity of America and its problems (e.g., in race relations or politics); and inaccuracy of popular images of America and Americans (as conveyed, for example, by Hollywood movies); the progress and advances in improving race relations; and the generosity, hospitality, and industriousness of Americans. Some of these themes emerge clearly from the following sample responses:

> The kind of information I would present is, first of all, the vastness of the place. The hardworking nature of the people. . . . The American achievements in the field of science, technology, education and industry. That is something which is worthy of emulation. Another aspect of American life which I would stress is the great effort being made by all Americans to weld together into a people of different nations and races. I think there is an opportunity there for a unique achievement for the American people, and I would stress it. . . . Another thing: the human side. . . . The American people by and large are good-natured, kind-hearted people -- and they enjoy a good laugh, like the African people, which is different from the British, who are a bit phlegmatic.

> America is a new society, taken from a lot of nations. . . . First, I stressed that I can't give the whole image about the country and the people. . . . It is very difficult to tell that America is this kind of country or that kind of country. . . . People say that all Americans are capitalists and so on. But if you look at people you see that they are different -- not all are the same. Many want peace. . . . I tried to stress that people at the other end of the earth are just like people here. They are hard-working. Some are rich, some poor; there is some unemployment, but they have insurance, help of the government. I tried to say it is a big country,

> with many problems. . . .
>
> I would stress the importance that is given to the role of education in the U.S. The diversity of forms of education. The easy availability. In particular, I would dwell on life on the campus -- I would stress this very alive give-and-take that goes on among students. It seemed to me that there was a real search -- a search for knowledge. As for the racial issue, I would try to present the problem in its right context -- the historical development of the problem, how it came about; what the problem is right now; why there are so many vested interests against desegregation; the clash between the state and federal authority; the difficulty the President is facing in trying to make a decision, which is mainly political. I would say that in the moral sphere most people are desegregationists. . . .
>
> It is impossible to generalize about American life, how very varied it is. . . . When you leave New York and Boston you really feel that you are in America. That's where the differences really start. . . . One of the things that makes America so attractive, that gives flavor to it, is that it is still a country of immigrants. . . .

The point that comes up repeatedly in these remarks is that America is diverse, heterogeneous, and complex. It was stressed again when participants were asked whether or not "one can speak of an American attitude or point of view." Only 3 respondents were willing to speak, without qualification, of a general American point of view; 11 felt that there was a general point of view, but that one had to keep in mind America's complexity and diversity; and 12 felt that the complexity and diversity of America were so great that one could not possibly speak of a single point of view. Some of the negative answers to the question about an American point of view took this form:

> No, there is no firm American attitude. On the eastern seaboard, there is a sense of enthusiasm, a liberal outlook which is in sharp contrast with the reactionary attitude in the south. I found that the isolationism talked of in the mid-west does exist. As to the west coast -- anti-intellectualism would be wrong -- there seems to be, though, a relatively careless attitude toward politics. In short, there is no American attitude.
>
> I am convinced you can't. There is the official attitude from Washington, shared perhaps by a million Americans. And then the average American. And the attitudes are very different indeed. I don't think one can speak of an American attitude. It varies with the part of the country one comes from, the intellectual level, the amount of travel. I came back convinced with what I already believed: that one cannot speak of America as a country. It's a continent. . . .

> You can speak of an "official" American attitude. . . . but you cannot talk of an American viewpoint as you travel across the States. There are at least three or four dozen different viewpoints. While there is an official view, the majority of Americans are not necessarily in possession of it.

In answer to this question and subsequent ones, many participants distinguished subgroups within the American population -- groups differing in level of education, ethnic background, socio-economic status, political preference and regional origin -- who differ in their basic points of view.

Many participants, while stressing the complexity and diversity of America, were willing to mention attitudes that at least came close to constituting a general American point of view. Most frequently mentioned were the belief in freedom and democratic values, and the preoccupation with Communism. They are contained, in some form, in each of the following quotations:

> One is repeatedly brought up against. . . the American conception of freedom. . . . It seems sometimes naive and over-optimistic in its assessment of the virtues of humankind: that laissez-faire attitudes will bring the best to the top. Every weakness, of course, has its counterpart in strength. You have these extraordinary contradictions. There is this strong feeling on the one hand that no one can knock you around, tell you how to conduct your affairs. On the other hand, you have this strong streak of conformism -- which is anti-individualistic and results in. . . strains. . . . I think this rather naive conception of freedom is also the thing which leads to an over-simplified classification of political attitudes into Black and White -- an over-simplified attitude to the problem of living with the Russians, and so on. Then, the conception of progress, I think, is a bit distorted in America. There is a willingness to innovate, which is marvellous. But it is often allied with insufficient thought about the validity of the innovation. Again, there is this magnificent belief that anything is possible. Problems are regarded as challenges to action. And, although no doubt there are subtleties of social stratification, there is still, I think, for the visitor a very strong feeling that one is being judged for what one is, and not for the label one bears. And that is a splendid characteristic too.

> Americans seem to have an obsession with thinking about the Cold War. Who is against us. They can't be without a stand. Now, as for economic matters -- each person has to be for himself. The state shouldn't do too much, or else people will get flabby. . . . The individual's rights are important. Due process is emphasized. There seems to be a healthy acceptance of individual rights. The government can not grow greater than the law.

> I could mention several American attitudes. American pride in feeling a free-nation -- you meet this everywhere: people saying "We are a free people in a free country." Together with this, you have freedom of enterprise. There must be several other freedoms. They like to feel free to discuss political issues. This same sense of freedom makes them hate communism and socialism. [Socialism] seems to be as bad as communism -- I suppose because it means state interference in economics. There is an attitude towards helping other nations. Speaking very, very generally, I would say I came away with the feeling that the American nation is a very conformist nation. There is no room for the rebel, the non-conformist.

Other attitudes mentioned, though with less frequency, as constituting a general American point of view, were a certain internationalism of outlook; an awareness of America's importance in world affairs; a respect for hard work; and -- as can be seen in the above quotations -- a tendency toward conformity.

Responses to the post-return interview confirm, in essence, the conclusions we drew from the third interview. Participants' images of America vary greatly, although certain common themes emerge again and again. Some of these are positive in tone, some are negative, and some cannot really be placed on a favorable-unfavorable dimension. On the whole, the participants' view of America and of Americans is clearly more positive than it is negative, but it is by no means wholly noncritical. The point that comes up most frequently, and most emphatically, however, is the participants' awareness of the complexity and diversity of America. Not only are they cognizant of these characteristics of America and its population, but they often speak knowledgeably about the kinds of differences that do exist and are able to evaluate them differentially.

# CHAPTER 10

# COMPARISON OF PARTICIPANT AND CONTROL RESPONSES TO THE POST-RETURN INTERVIEW

All participants and their controls were interviewed in their home countries a year after the participants' American sojourn. This chapter compares responses of the 28 participants and the 28 controls in this post-return interview. We shall report all interview items for which there is a difference of 5 or more between the number of participants and the number of controls to whom the item applies (i.e., a difference of 18%).

The group differences that the items suggest are twofold. First, the participants emerge on several items as having attained a more differentiated conception of America. Second, the controls seem more ready to denigrate their own country in relation to America.

The participant speaks of American diversity and complexity. He says that there is no such thing as a single American point of view. He speaks of things that reflect an insider's knowledge of Americans--the life of the average American, the generosity and friendliness of Americans, American devotion to equality, the zealousness and enthusiasm of American broadcasters. He is aware of the salience of economic status in American life.

The control speaks of his country's limitations, its dependency on the United States. He says that the national media need improved programs, need more trained personnel, could use technical advice and broadcasting equipment. He is optimistic about the benefits of exchange. He thinks American broadcasters are more efficient than those at home. He would rely on official U.S. information sources to learn about the United States. His view of America is dominated by the U.S. aid program. He has come to feel less favorably about his home country during the past year.

The control's image is dominated by the relations between the two countries: He has a more idealized image of America, centered on what America can do for his country. The participant has acquired a more differentiated, more specific view, that sees the United States and American broadcasting in their own terms and with more realism about the benefits one may expect from association with the United States. He has established a more individualized relation to the United States that goes beyond the general relations between the nations.

## Perceptions of America and Americans

As might be expected, the participants' picture of America a year after the Seminar is quite different from that of the controls. The elements of this difference fully support the conclusions of Chapter 9. The discriminating interview items relevant to perceptions of America can be found in Table 10.1.

As may be seen, some differences reflect the immediacy of experience from which the participant can speak. He can present

Table 10.1

## PERCEPTIONS OF AMERICA: COMPARISON OF PARTICIPANTS AND CONTROLS

| Items that Discriminate | Participants | Controls |
|---|---|---|
| Type of programs about America that communicator has presented or is likely to present: | | |
| --personal report on experiences in America | 15 | 1 |
| --instructional programs about American life, history, geography | 6 | 12 |
| --documentary or special feature program about some aspect of American life | 17 | 21 |
| Information presented or likely to be presented in such programs would include descriptions of the lives of average Americans | 10 | 5 |
| Main themes presented or likely to be presented would include: | | |
| --the generosity and hospitality of Americans (kindness, openness, friendliness) | 6 | 0 |
| --the diversity and heterogeneity of America (institutions and people) | 10 | 4 |
| --the complexity of America and its problems (racial, political, etc.) | 9 | 4 |
| Sources from which respondent would obtain material about U.S. include official American sources in own country | 14 | 24 |
| Bases for selecting groups of Americans who differ in their impressions of respondent's own country include direct contact with country | 10 | 16 |
| Respondent's judgment as to whether there is such a thing as an "American attitude or point of view": | | |
| --There is no such thing as an American point of view | 1 | 0 |
| --One can't speak of a single American point of view because of America's complexity and diversity | 11 | 3 |
| --There is a general point of view but one must be aware of America's complexity and diversity | 11 | 15 |
| --There is a general American point of view (unqualified statement) | 3 | 7 |
| --Respondent does not answer | 2 | 3 |
| Perceived components of American point of view include the belief in democratic values (equality, freedom of press, etc.) | 12 | 5 |
| American groups perceived as differing in basic point of view include economic groups (e.g., upper, middle, lower classes) | 9 | 2 |

a program about his own experiences in America--a program that might well have more impact than more formal instructional or documentary programs. Moreover, he is not as likely to be dependent upon official American sources for materials for his programs; he knows how to call on private American networks, personal contacts, on foundations and universities, in addition to sources such as the Embassy and USIS. But we gain more insight into the effects of the sojourn if we ask what differences there are between the groups in terms of the materials that might be presented in a program.

(1) In the first place, the participant is more likely to feel that he can present a program about the lives of average Americans. This is an important result of his immediate contact. Both groups are able to prepare programs covering descriptions of the country, of special places and people, of institutions, or of the racial situation. Helpful as programming of that sort is, there is much to be said for the additional ability to speak, from intimacy of contact, about the everyday life of the average man, to speak on home broadcasting systems to a home audience in terms that allow America to emerge as a country occupied by understandable, non-mythical people, ordinary individuals engaged in pursuits that are recognizable to the man who is listening. One participant, for example, describes part of a report he had prepared in the following words:

> I also wrote my impression about life in an American typical family, about the relations between the members of a family--i.e., the father, mother, and the grown children. . . . I started with one impression of life in an American family. It started on a Saturday afternoon in the summer. They were going on a trip with the family. . . . The family enters and the husband makes a couple of jokes. They are very good people--he is a dear man. He helps his wife in the kitchen. He is a man of 55 years. His wife was always "honey, dear." His son came from college and drove a truck and delivered pop. He didn't wear shoes or a shirt. He was drinking orange juice, and the others were swimming. I wanted to say to the people that the evaluation of the man was through his activity--i.e., he could live very good in his parents' house, but the father wanted his son to earn a living by his own labors. (How was this report received?) The people told me it was very interesting. It was fresh to the people.

(2) Only among the participants do we find a group who feel that a major theme that should be presented in programs is the kindliness, the openness, the friendliness of Americans. A comment made by an African, and already quoted in part in the preceding chapter is worth repeating in this connection:

> . . . Another thing: the human side. Barring the occasional racial eruption which takes place, the American people by and large are good-natured, kind-hearted people--and they enjoy a good laugh, like the African people, which is different from the British, who are a bit phlegmatic.

(3) The participants' awareness of the complexity and diversity of America, stressed so much in the preceding chapter, emerges clearly in the comparison with the controls. When a participant presents a program about America, he is more likely to highlight as one of its major themes, the complicated, diverse, pluralistic reality of America. He is less likely to present a simplistic picture, to accept a single-minded interpretation, to analyze along a single dimension. America is to him a diverse land, a heterogeneous land of varied people and complex problems that do not yield to quick solutions. Two quotations by African participants speaking on the problems of race relations in America illustrate this point nicely:

> In this country people have stereotyped ideas about what happens in America. The idea was to either confirm or blow up stereotypes about America. . . . On the race question, people here think it is either black or white. I found there were many shades of gray in between. . . . There are extreme positions on both sides--but there are many who hold positions between these extremes. One hears more about the atrocities that are perpetrated against American Negroes, because this is sensation. But one hears little about how little American Negroes are doing for themselves--which I found annoying. And opinions on the race question are not as clearly demarcated as they appear on the outside.

> . . . They /members of the respondent's own society/ didn't know that there were some white Americans who contribute to the eradication of discrimination in the States. They thought white and blacks were in conflict. . . . (What were the main points you tried to make in the program?) What the real position is. How the Negroes are reacting to new developments. (What new development?) Well, in the past the Negroes supported the NAACP, but now there are dynamic young men who are coming to talk to them and educate them--for example, from CORE. . . . Also about the formation of the Black Muslims--their role. I compared it to the Ku Klux Klan. . . . I also mentioned my incident /discrimination/ in Raleigh; also how the Kennedy administration appeared to be very much concerned with racial discimination. . . .

(4) A closely related point of difference between participants and controls is that for the participants the perception of American complexity was so salient that many found it difficult to speak seriously about such a thing as "an American point of view." They considered it impossible to give a hasty answer when asked, "How do Americans feel about this or that issue." Thus, one participant told the interviewer that one cannot speak of an American point of view because "you are the most diversified people in the world." An African responded to the same question:

> It is extremely difficult. I thought one could /speak of an American point of view/ before I went to the United States. Except for one thing, as I said: American attitudes toward Communism. That's pretty general, although

> even there you can pick out the university people. No matter what they believe, at least they have reasons for their attitudes. It's extremely difficult to generalize --which I wish a large number of Americans would realize about this country.

And a European commented:

> It is very difficult to tell. I think newsmen all over the world--yours and others--try to establish something like that. But I think there are many components which make up the American point of view, the American way of life. Different people speak quite differently--each has his own point of view. Many are different from the official point of view. We can speak of the official American point of view--but not everyone holds that point of view. . .

(5) Participants and controls differ in terms of which groups within American society they identify as having different points of view. They are equally likely to mention groups varying in education, region, and race, as differing in point of view, but the participants are more likely than the controls to mention socio-economic groups as differing in point of view Perhaps the controls have a greater tendency to see America in terms of the stereotype of "the rich nation," and are thus less cognizant of socio-economic differences within America and differences in point of view built upon these.

(6) Finally, when asked about the components of what might be termed an American point of view, participants are more likely than controls to include the belief in democratic values. For example, an African respondent described as a component of an American point of view:

> . . . the people's own background of a constitution, which I like, and which people speak very favorably of. Some Americans who were very simple said to me: "The Constitution says. . ." They didn't know much about the content of the Constitution, but they knew it was there and were committed to it. . .

Several other quotations relevant to this point can be found in the preceding chapter (pages 9-16 and 9-17).

## Perceptions of American Broadcasters

The respondents were asked a number of questions about American broadcasters. Most coding categories yield similar frequencies for participants and controls. Participants, however, were much more likely to include enthusiasm and zealousness in relation to work in their list of American virtues. Such comments were made by thirteen participants and by only three controls. Thus, an African notes that "my impression was that they were very hard-working people," and an Asian comments "I can't think of any differences /between broadcasters in America and my country/ except perhaps they work harder."

On the other hand, familiarity has dimmed illusions about great disparities of talent. Eleven controls, but only five participants, believe that broadcasters in their home country differ greatly from American broadcasters in terms of competence.

## Views Regarding International Exchange

Table 10.2 presents those discriminating items that deal with views on international exchange. Both groups feel that other countries can help in the development of broadcasting in the home country by exchanging programs, personnel, and ideas; controls also suggest the exchange of broadcasting equipment. Both groups believe that exchange can lead to real increases in technical skill (an item accepted by eighteen participants and sixteen controls), but the participants are considerably more dubious about the training value of exposure to ideas and practices in other countries with an eye to adapting these to the home country. It would seem that they have learned how difficult it is to make such adaptations; or perhaps, in some instances, they would prefer to avoid the ideas and practices of others even if they could be readily adapted. Participants are also more dubious than controls about the training value of increasing broadcasters' knowledge of media in other countries--again, perhaps, because they consider as remote the possibility of adapting these to their own situations.

The somewhat limited endorsement that these items suggest seems to appear elsewhere as well. When asked what kinds of exchange would be valuable, the participants are less likely to cite exchange of personnel; and appear more satisfied with the simple exchange of information about developments in the communication media.

Some of the professional contacts made in America have survived the year. Participants reported more current professional contacts than controls with Americans in the broadcasting and educational networks, and, of course, with the Seminar directors. Given these American contacts, the participant may have less need for connections with foreigners in third countries. In any case, controls report more professional contacts with third-country nationals. The only category of third-country contact in which participants inevitably show greater numbers is that of contact with one another.

## Views on Broadcasting

Most respondents expected many new developments in broadcasting in their own countries. Most were fairly well satisfied with the directions that those developments were taking. Controls, however, were more likely to hope that one would be seeing an increase in the number of trained personnel; ten controls said this, as compared to three participants. Controls were also more likely to say that they hoped to see an improvement in the quality of programs; twelve controls made this point, but only five participants. One wonders whether this means that participants felt less apologetic about the quality of programs at home after seeing American programs.

Nineteen controls said that their ideas about broadcasting had not changed during the year; only thirteen participants admitted to

Table 10.2

## VIEWS REGARDING INTERNATIONAL EXCHANGE: COMPARISON OF PARTICIPANTS AND CONTROLS

| Items that Discriminate | Participants | Controls |
|---|---|---|
| Contributions that other countries could make to development of broadcasting in home country--includes supply of broadcasting equipment | 3 | 9 |
| Contributions that international exchange could make to training of broadcasters in own country includes: | | |
| --increasing their knowledge of broadcasting or communication media in other countries | 5 | 12 |
| --exposing them to ideas and practices in other countries that they can adapt to own situation | 6 | 17 |
| Valuable forms of international exchange for broadcasters includes: | | |
| --exchange of personnel between networks | 10 | 16 |
| --exchange of information about developments in communication media | 15 | 8 |
| Present professional contacts with Americans include: | | |
| --American broadcasting networks and educational networks | 16 | 10 |
| --directors of the Seminar | 8 | 0 |
| --professional literature | 9 | 4 |
| Contacts with individuals or organizations in other countries aside from America: | | |
| --has none | 7 | 1 |
| --has contact with networks | 11 | 19 |
| --has contact with other Seminar participants | 6 | 0 |

such static views. The new views that were cited were rather similar, with two exceptions. Participants became more convinced about the importance of emphasizing the development of TV. They became also more convinced, however, that--despite the development of TV--the emphasis on radio should continue or be even more pronounced in their countries. This may well be a product of their experience in America where--many participants have felt--radio has been allowed to decline in vigor with the advent of TV.

## Other Comparisons

Job Changes. Two thirds of each group reported a change in position or responsibilities. Twelve participants, but only seven controls, attributed these changes to the recognition of their own abilities. The two groups are otherwise similar in reported job satisfaction, in expectations of change, and in innovativeness on the job.

Views of the Home Country. There was no difference in the number of participants and controls who reported gaining a clearer view of the role of their own countries; or who reported gaining a more differentiated view; or who reported, simply, gaining a more favorable view. Controls were, however, more likely than participants to report that they had become less favorably inclined toward their own countries in the course of the year (two participants as compared to nine controls give such a response). Instead, participants are more likely to report no change at all (eight vs. three). Thus, it appears that the experience in America kept some participants, who might otherwise have done so, from developing a more negative view of their home countries. It is possible that participation in the Seminar had somehow insulated them against developing a sense of disaffection from the home country. Perhaps they brought home a higher morale and more energy; perhaps they learned to judge the home country from a greater distance and with more compassion and patience; perhaps they were buoyed by new skills or prestige.

Interest in Future Visits. Respondents were asked whether they wished to visit America in the future. The greater interest of the participants is shown in the following tabulation:

| | Participants | Controls |
|---|---|---|
| Moderate desire to visit U.S. | 11 | 16 |
| Strong desire to visit U.S. | 16 | 10 |
| Thinks a visit unlikely | 5 | 10 |
| Would like to visit: | | |
| --on an individual professional basis | 21 | 12 |
| --as part of an organized exchange program | 5 | 13 |

The participants think it more likely that they can make another trip, although this time they would probably have to come on an individual basis.

# CHAPTER 11

## CHANGES IN IMAGES OF THE UNITED STATES AND OF THE FIELD OF BROADCASTING

In Chapter 3 we described the "Questionnaire for Specialists in Broadcasting" (See Appendix A), which was administered to the participants and to a comparison group before the beginning of the Seminar and again approximately nine months to a year after the completion of the Seminar. These questionnaires are our primary source of information about changes attributable to participation in the Seminar.

### Rationale and Purpose of the Questionnaire

The present Seminar--in keeping with the goals of other similar exchange programs--aimed, among other things, to provide the participants with a professionally useful experience, yielding new information, new ideas, and new contacts that can enhance their professional work; and to provide them with first-hand knowledge of American mass media, as well as of American society and American life in general. To the extent that these goals are fulfilled, one would expect some changes in the participants' images of and attitudes toward their professional field--which would involve both their images of the broadcasting media in their own countries, and of their own professional roles. Similarly, one would expect some changes in images of and attitudes toward America, particularly American broadcasting media. The purpose of the questionnaire in the present study was to assess whether such changes do indeed occur. By comparing answers that participants gave before the Seminar with those they gave after the Seminar, we can get some idea of the extent to which the intervening period produced the expected changes. By comparing these changes to changes manifested by the comparison group, we can determine whether they can in fact be attributed to the participants' experience in America.

In developing questions that would tap the respondents' images of America, we placed our emphasis on American mass media. Thus, a large proportion of the questions dealt specifically with American broadcasting--its functions, contributions, and problems. Even those questions that focused on America and Americans in general were linked, insofar as possible, to the respondents' professional concerns with the mass media. For example, Questions 11 and 12, which asked the respondent to describe the impressions that Americans have of his own country, were linked to the coverage of information about his country by the American mass media. Question 15, which was designed to tap the aspects of the U.S. that the respondent considered important, was linked to the coverage of information about the U.S. by his country's mass media.

There were two reasons for this emphasis. First, given the focus of the Seminar and the professional concerns of the participants, changes in the view of American mass media are of more direct and obvious relevance than changes in the view of any other aspect of American life. Individual participants may show changes in one or another area, in view of their _particular_ interests and experiences; for the group as a whole, however, it is most reasonable to expect changes with regard to the mass media, since this represents an area of interest and experience shared by all participants. Moreover, changes in this area are likely to have continuing and far-reaching effects, since they tie in with the participants' professional activities. Thus, questions relating to the American mass media are of particular interest for an evaluation of the effectiveness of the Seminar in achieving its goals.

The second reason for the emphasis on the mass media relates to the maintenance of rapport with the respondents. We felt that respondents might resent too many questions that focus directly on their images of and attitudes toward America. They might feel "put on the spot" by questions about America posed by American researchers; and they might interpret these questions as evidence that the Seminar is primarily a "public relations" device, designed to create a favorable image of America. Questions that are clearly related to the respondents' professional concerns, however, would not elicit such resentment. Consequently, the questionnaire emphasized American broadcasting media; and phrased even the more general questions in ways that related them to the respondents' professional concerns.

Nevertheless, the questionnaire does provide information about the respondents' views of America in general and changes in these views. For one thing, their views of American mass media certainly reflect, at least to some degree, their general views of American society and its institutions. The mass media are, after all, a key institution in the society and, moreover, the one to which they had the greatest exposure. For another thing, the general questions, despite their indirect nature, provide rather meaningful contexts for assessing the respondents' images of America. Thus, question 15 asks the respondent what he, as a broadcaster, would want to communicate about America to his own countrymen. Questions 11 and 12 explore the respondent's perception of what impressions Americans have of his country--a highly salient dimension for evaluating the nationals of another country. A respondent's perception of Americans on this dimension is likely to determine his general attitude toward them; and his answers to these questions are likely to reflect this general attitude.

Question 12 exemplifies another basic assumption underlying our whole approach to the assessment of images and attitudes about American broadcasting and America and Americans in general. Our primary interest is not at all in assessing the degree to which the participants' images and attitudes become more _favorable_ as a result of their American experience. Rather, we are concerned with the _cognitive structure_ of these images and attitudes. There is no particular reason to expect that a sojourn in a foreign country, even under the best of circumstances, will produce an increase in over-all favorableness toward that country. To be sure, there is the likelihood that the person's attitude will become warmer and more personal, if he has had satisfying experiences and formed meaningful interpersonal relationships with nationals of the host country. Yet, he need not become more favorable on the whole toward the country and its institutions. Those who start out with negative attitudes may find confirming evidence for them; those who start out with positive attitudes may have little room for change in the favorable direction; and those who start out neutral may find some things they like and others they dislike. It would be unrealistic to expect marked changes on this dimension to result from international exchange programs. Nor is the uncritical acceptance of all features of the host country even a desirable goal for international exchanges. What is both realistic and desirable, however, as an outcome of such programs are qualitative changes in the cognitive structure of images of the host country. Thus, the organizers and sponsors of the present Seminar were particularly interested in the extent to which participants would gain a fuller, richer, more detailed, and more refined picture of American mass media and American society in general (see Chapter 2). Such a change would imply an increased awareness of the range of activities and points of view in American broadcasting and American life in general; a deeper understanding of patterns and problems from the inside; and an increased ability to respond differentially to different segments of American society and different aspects of American life (including the mass media). As a matter of fact, a global undifferentiated positive attitude would be as antithetical to this type of orientation as a global undifferentiated negative attitude.

In line with the assumptions that have just been outlined, we made special efforts to capture the complexity and differentiation of images and attitudes, both in the formulation of questions and in the coding of responses (to be discussed below). We did not ignore the dimension of favorableness toward America and American broadcasting, but we regarded it as of secondary importance. This approach to attitude measurement also has some methodological advantages, especially in a situation such as the present one. The favorable-unfavorable dimension is often subject to distortion and presents difficulties in interpretation. At best it gives only a limited picture of a person's attitude toward an object, which must be supplemented by assessment of the cognitive dimensions of the attitude.

In addition to tapping images of America, including American broadcasting, the questionnaire explored the respondents' images of and attitudes toward their professional field. These parts of the questionnaire included, first of all, questions about the broadcasting media in the respondent's own country--their roles in society, their specific functions, their contributions, and their problems. It was assumed that participation in the Seminar, exposure to American mass media, and exchange of ideas with colleagues from around the world, might produce changes in a person's images in this area. He might, for example, become aware of certain new possibilities for the development of broadcasting in his country, or of certain new problems that need to be solved, or of certain new approaches that can be applied. He may become more or less satisfied with the status of the media in his country. And, again, changes in the cognitive structure of his attitudes may take place: for instance, he may develop a more complex and differentiated view of the role that the broadcasting media in his country can perform. These were the kinds of changes the questionnaire was designed to tap.

Similarly, participation in the Seminar may produce changes in the person's attitude toward his own professional role and his activities within the field of broadcasting. The questionnaire

3

thus included items designed to explore the respondent's definition of his professional role, his assessment of the importance of different aspects of his job, his satisfactions and dissatisfactions with his professional life, and his hopes and expectations for the future. These are all areas that may very well be affected by the kinds of experiences that the Seminar provided for its participants.

It can be assumed that an effective Seminar would probably produce some changes in the participants' professional images--their images both of their field and of their own roles within it. It is very difficult, however, to specify what form these changes ought to take. They are likely to be quite different for different individuals--depending on the person's professional position, on the level of development of broadcasting in his own country, and so on. Perhaps the only general statement that can be made is that the person ought, ideally, to come away with a richer and more differentiated view of his professional field, reflecting new insights derived from exchange of ideas and exposure to new patterns.

## Coding of Questionnaire Responses

Pre-coded questions. Those questions in which respondents were merely asked to choose from among a set of predetermined responses presented no special coding problems, since the coding categories were already built into the question. For the more complex pre-coded questions (1, 2, 16, and 20), however, composite indices were developed, based on a combination of the various sub-parts of each question and a comparison of the before- and after-questionnaires.

Thus, for question 1, two indices were developed: an index of the over-all amount of change (from the first to the second questionnaire) in the respondent's view of the actual pattern of activities for TV in his country; and an index of the over-all amount of change in the respondent's view of the ideal pattern of activities for TV in his country. For question 2, two parallel indices were developed, dealing with the respondent's views of TV in America. In addition, for each questionnaire, a special index was computed based on the comparison between answers to questions 1 and 2: this index represents the extent of difference in the patterns of activities that the respondent attributes to TV in his own country and in the U.S. By comparing the value of this index on the second questionnaire with that on the first questionnaire, we can determine whether and to what degree the respondent now sees American TV as more different from (or more similar to) TV in his own country than he did before.

For question 16, an index of the over-all amount of change in the respondent's evaluation of the activities associated with his job was constructed. For question 20, indices of change in the respondent's definition of his professional role were developed.

Open-ended questions. For those questions to which respondents answered in their own words, coding categories had to be developed to permit analysis of the material. The categories were based on a combination of two considerations: the kinds of information that a particular question was designed to yield, and the kinds of information that it actually yielded, as revealed by an examination of a sample of responses.

Two types of codes were developed: (1) Content codes, i.e., lists of content categories to which responses to a given question can be assigned. For example, the content code for question 3 consisted of a list of "areas in which others can benefit from experiences of respondent's own country." For a given respondent, more than one area can apply (i.e., content codes are "multiple codes"). For example, his answer may suggest that others can learn something from the pattern of ownership of the broadcasting system in his country, and from its approach to programming. In this case, the coder would check both of these categories on the list of ten categories that this particular code happens to contain. (2) Rating scales, i.e., orderings of positions on a particular dimension in terms of which responses to a given question can be rated. For example, the coders were asked to rate answers to question 3 in terms of the "extent of perceived contribution of respondent's own country." In this case, a four-point scale was used ranging from "no contribution" (i.e., respondent feels that his own country has nothing to contribute, from its experiences, to broadcasters in other countries) to "major contribution." Rating scales are "single codes," i.e., only one category can be checked for each respondent, and the coder has to select the one that seems to apply most closely.

For most questions, several codes were developed to capture the relevant information. Typically, these would include both a content code and a rating scale, as in question 3--the example used in the preceding paragraph. Some of the content codes were, moreover, combined with rating scales. Thus, in the content code for question 3, the coders were asked to check the content areas mentioned by a given respondent and then, for each area checked, to rate the strength of emphasis it receives in the response on a three-point scale.

For some of the questions, more than one content code was used. For example, for the analysis of questions 7 and 8, three lists were developed: areas in which TV (in America, or in home country) faces problems; causes of problems faced by TV; and proposed solutions for these problems. For some of the questions, more than one rating scale was developed. For example, each respondent's description of the typical American in response to question 11 was rated on three dimensions: how well informed or ignorant about the respondent's own country the typical American is described to be; how sympathetic he is to the respondent's own country; and how much he accepts the respondent's country as an equal. Finally, some rating scales were designed to capture a quality characteristic of responses to several questions. Thus, for example, coders were asked to rate the respondent's general attitude toward American TV on a five-point scale (from extremely favorable to extremely unfavorable); these ratings were based on responses to questions 4, 6, and 7.

Altogether, 33 codes were developed for the analysis of the open-ended questions. (This is exclusive of the complexity-differentiation ratings to be described in the next section.) All of the questionnaires were coded by a "primary coder," who was "blind" in the sense that he did not know whether any given questionnaire that he was working on was completed by a Sminar participant or a comparison group member, nor whether it was filled out before (1962) or after (1963). In order to increase coding reliability, the following procedure was used: (1) on eight of the codes, all of the questionnaires were analyzed by a "check-coder" in addition to the primary coder. In cases of disagreement between the two coders, final judgments were arrived at by bringing in a third coder and/or by conference. (2) On the other 25 codes, ten questionnaires were analyzed by a check-coder, whose judgments were then compared with those of the primary coder. Disagreements were resolved by conference between the two coders. For eighteen codes, the agreement between the two was so high that it was possible to use the primary coder's judgments on the remaining 88 questionnaires without further review. For five codes, agreement was quite high, but the conferences between the two coders produced a slight revision in coding criteria; the primary coder therefore reviewed his original judgments on the remaining 88 questionnaires in the light of the revised criteria. Finally, for two codes there was enough disagreement to warrant check-coding on all of the remaining questionnaires; the primary coder and the check-coder then proceeded to compare all of their judgments and, in cases of disagreement, to arrive at final judgments through conference.

Complexity-differentiation ratings. In view of our special interest in the cognitive structure of images and attitudes, we tried to capture in our coding scheme not only the specific content of responses, but also their structure or style. Specifically, we wanted to assess the degree to which different responses revealed a complex and differentiated image of the object under discussion--whether it be American broadcasting, American society in general, or broadcasting in the respondent's own country. Our expectation was that participation in a successful Seminar should, on the whole, produce an increase in the degree of complexity and differentiation of these images.

Two simple three-point rating-scales were constructed and applied to responses to all open-ended questions concerned with American broadcasting, America and Americans in general, and broadcasting in the respondent's own country (questions 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, and 15b). The first scale called for a rating of range of response. The rating criteria for this dimension were defined quite objectively: ratings depended on the number of distinct points a respondent made in response to a given question. For example, in answering question 3, respondents could mention various areas in which others could benefit from broadcasting experiences of their own countries. If a respondent mentioned just one distinct area, he received a rating of 1 (narrow range); if he mentioned two distinct areas, he received a rating of 2 (moderate range); and if he mentioned three or more areas, a rating of 3 (broad range).

The second scale called for a rating of depth of response and required somewhat more subjective judgments. Two criteria were taken into consideration in making these judgments: the elaborateness of the response, and the importance of the points mentioned. Thus, however many or few areas might be mentioned in a response to question 3, the discussion of each area could vary in its elaborateness: it might range from a mere mention of the area, to a detailed exposition of it. Similarly, the areas mentioned could vary in their importance: they could refer to central features of the broadcasting system, its organization, and its role in society (e.g., the sponsorship of TV in the country; the use of TV as a means of combatting illiteracy or creating national unity); or they could refer to relatively minor features (e.g., the type of lighting effects used; the use of canned versus live programs). This obviously calls for subjective judgments, but the consensus among the coders was amazingly high. The combination of the two criteria--elaborateness and importance--yielded one of three judgments: if a respondent merely mentioned the areas, or if he discussed "unimportant" areas with little detail, he received a rating of 1 (superficial coverage of content areas); if he discussed moderately important areas with little detail, or unimportant areas with considerable detail, he received a rating of 2 (moderately detailed and elaborate coverage); and if he discussed important or moderately important areas with considerable detail, he received a rating of 3 (very detailed and elaborate discussion).

In order to increase the reliability of these ratings, they were done independently by three coders. The primary coder, as was already mentioned, did the ratings "blind." The check-coders knew whether they were coding a before- or an after-questionnaire, by a participant or a control. They did not, however, code the before- and after-questionnaires of the same respondent in close proximity to each other. Thus, biases that might arise from the coders' expectations of change were minimized.

In cases of disagreement among the coders, the following procedure was used for arriving at the final rating: If two out of the three coders agreed on the rating, their judgment prevailed. In the rare cases in which all three coders disagreed with each other, the middle rating (which also represents the average of the three ratings) served as the final score.

The level of agreement among the coders was very high. In the majority of cases, all three coders independently gave the same rating. Only on several occasions did all three raters disagree. As for the cases in which two out of the three raters agreed and their judgment prevailed, we decided that it would be important to check on the distribution of the "winning" pairs. If it were to turn out that the two check-coders constituted the winning pair on a disproportionately large number of cases, this would be cause for concern, since there is at least some possibility of bias in their ratings (which were not done "blind"). Accordingly, twelve of the eighteen complexity-differentiation codes (the twelve which entered into the major index used in this report and described in a later section) were analyzed in detail, to determine how the final scores were arrived at. The results indicate very clearly that the two check-coders do not dominate the final ratings. As a matter of fact, the primary coder tends to be in the winning pair more often than the other two. We feel quite reassured, therefore, that the complexity-differentiation scores are not only reliable, but also relatively unaffected by obvious sources of coder bias.

## Interpretation of Questionnaire Results

In interpreting the results of the questionnaire study, we must be fully aware of the limitations of these data. First, as has already been pointed out (Chapter 3 ), the comparison group is not only incomplete, but also provides less than a perfect match for the Seminar participants. Secondly, there were many gaps in respondents' answers to the questionnaires. Many respondents, for example, failed to answer some of the questions about America or American broadcasting because they felt that they lacked the necessary information. Moreover, if a respondent failed to answer a given question on one of the questionnaires, we could not use his answer to the same question on the second questionnaire either, since our concern was with the assessment of change. Thus, most of our analyses are based on fewer than the total number of cases. Thirdly, there was considerable variation in the fullness with which individual questions were answered. While some responses were very rich, others were quite sparse. Some respondents had obvious difficulties in the use of English; others were unaccustomed to this type of questionnaire procedure. On the whole, the questionnaires did not offer the opportunities for communicating the intent of questions, for eliciting full responses, and for following these up and exploring them further, that were present in the personal interviews. Understandably, therefore, the questionnaire responses are less rich and complete and often do not do justice to the views of the respondent.

Yet, at the same time, the questionnaire data make a very unique and important contribution to the over-all design of the evaluation study. This is the only part of the study in which identical questions were presented both before and after the Seminar, and both to the participants and to the comparison group. Thus, it is the only part of the study that meets the conditions of an experimental design permitting us to conclude whether or not the Seminar did in fact produce attitude change. This is not to say that other parts of the study provide no information about change. The interviews conducted while the participants were in the U.S. provide us with their own formulations of changes they were experiencing at the time. The follow-up interviews, obtained a year later, are especially rich sources of information about change, and there is the added advantage that comparable interviews with members of the comparison group were conducted at the same time. While these follow-up interviews do provide data about change, and even permit comparison, we do not have controlled before-interviews against which these data can be measured: the comparison group was not interviewed before at all, and the participants were interviewed shortly after their arrival in the U.S., but most of the questions in that interview differed from those on the follow-up interview. Thus, if we want to know whether participants responses to the same stimuli in 1963 differed from their responses in 1962, and if we want to have some reassurance that differences that are manifested are not due to extraneous factors, we must turn to the questionnaire data.

Given both the unique values of the questionnaire data and their limitations, what use can be made of them? We would argue that they must be used in conjunction with the much fuller and richer interview data. Theycan indicate--on the basis of fairly sound experimental evidence--whether we are justified in concluding that the Seminar did indeed produce some measurable changes. We must turn to the interview data, however, in order to learn just what these changes were. This we have done in the preceding chapters, which examined the nature of the changes by analyzing what the Seminar participants (wherever possible, in contrast to comparison group members) said about their professional roles, about broadcasting in their home countries and in America, and about American society in general; and how they themselves described their American experience and the effect it has had on them. In short, the questionnaire data in the present study can tell us, with some assurance, whether the Seminar had any measurable impact; and the interview data can inform us about the nature of that impact.

The results of the questionnaire study will be presented in two parts. First, changes on an index of differentiation of America, which constitute our major findings, will be described. This will be followed by a review of other changes revealed by the analysis.

## Differentiation of the Image of America and American Mass Media

As has already been indicated in our discussion of the rationale and purpose of the questionnaire, our major interest was in exploring changes in the cognitive structure of respondents' images of American broadcasting and America in general. It seemed to us reasonable to expect that participation in a four-month Seminar would produce more complex and differentiated images of the host country. Moreover, such changes represent a significant criterion for evaluation of international exchange programs: organizers of such programs would tend to agree with our judgment that a Seminar can be deemed successful in achieving one of its goals--that of having an impact on participants' images of the host country--if these images indeed become more complex and differentiated.

A preliminary inspection of our data revealed that it was indeed on this dimension that the most consistent changes seemed to occur. In view of this finding, taken together with our special interest in the cognitive dimensions, we decided to construct an over-all index of change in differentiation of the image of America. To construct this index, we used all of the codes that were designed to capture the complexity and differentiation of the respondents' images of one or another aspect of American life. The index includes codes that refer specifically to American broadcasting, as well as codes that refer to America and Americans more generally. Since the two sets of codes tended to produce similar results, and since it can be assumed that for our respondents American broadcasting is a highly salient feature of American life in general, it seemed reasonable to combine the two and thus provide a stabler measure. In all, the following fifteen codes entered into the index (see Appendix A for the questionnaire items on which these codes are based):

(1) The score for the extent of difference in patterns of activities that the respondent attributes to TV in his own country and in the U.S., based on comparison of responses to question 1 and question 2 (see section on pre-coded questions above). This score was derived as follows: for each activity on question 1, the respondent would receive a score of 3 if he checked it as a "major activity," a score of 2 if he checked it as a "minor activity," and a score of 1 if he checked it as one that is "hardly ever done." The same procedure was follows for each activity on question 2. For each of the activities, then, the discrepancy between the score on question 1 and the score on question 2 was computed (disregarding sign): for example, if "providing specific information" was checked

as a major activity (score 3) for the respondent's own TV system and "hardly ever done" (score 1) for American TV, he would receive a discrepancy score of 2 for this activity. The discrepancy scores for all thirteen activities were then summed to give us the total score for the extent of difference in the patterns of activities attributed to the two TV systems. The potential range of the scores was from 0 - 26; the actual range from 0 - 18. It was assumed that an increase on this score--i.e., an increased awareness of differences--from the before-questionnaire to the after-questionnaire would be an indication of a more highly differentiated image of American TV: as a person comes to see American TV in greater detail and in its own terms, he is more likely to become aware of its unique features and hence of the specific ways in which it differs from the TV system to which he himself is accustomed. (1)

(2) The rating of range of response to question 4, which called for discussion of experiences in broadcasting in the United States. Criteria for this and all other ratings of range of response are described above, in the section on complexity-differentiation ratings. In all cases, potential and actual range of scores was from 1 - 3.

(3) The rating of depth of response to question 4. Again, criteria for this and all other ratings of depth of response are described in the section on complexity-differentiation ratings. Potential and actual range of scores for all ratings of depth was from 1 - 3.

(4) The rating of range of response to question 6, which called for discussion of the differences in function between TV in the respondent's own country and TV in the United States. It was assumed that a wider-ranging response to this question would reflect a more differentiated image of American TV.

(5) The rating of depth of response to question 6. Again, it was assumed that a more detailed and elaborate response to question 6 would reflect a more highly differentiated image.

---

(1) It is possible to place a different interpretation on an increase in awareness of differences between the two systems. It could reflect a disenchantment with American TV, resulting in a tendency to reject it. Such rejection could take the form of exaggerating the differences between American TV and TV in the respondent's own country, with the implication that American TV is either inferior or irrelevant to his own system. If that were true, an increase in extent of differences would be a sign of global rejection rather than of an increase in differentiation of the image. We doubt very much, however, that this interpretation applies in the present case. An examination of other codes provides no evidence that the individuals who show increased awareness of differences also became less favorable to American TV; if anything, the trend is in the opposite direction. In support of our assumption, we find that individuals who show an increased awareness of differences also tend to be high on the over-all index of change in differentiation.

(6) The rating of range of response to question 7, which called for a discussion of problems facing American TV, the major causes of these problems, and possible measures that might alleviate them.

(7) The rating of depth of response to question 7.

(8) The rating of range of response to question 11, which called for a discussion of the impressions Americans have of the respondent's own country. This question was designed to yield some information on the respondent's image of the "typical American."

(9) The rating of depth of response to question 11.

(10) A score for the extent to which the respondent's answer to question 12 indicates specific knowledge and differentiation of American society. Question 12 asked the respondent whether he could think of groups of Americans whose impressions of his country differed from those he had just attributed to the "typical American" in his answer to question 11. It was assumed that the more such groups he was able to mention, the more differentiated his image of American society--i.e., the greater his awareness of sub-segments of American society, each with its own unique characteristics. We also felt, however, that the nature of the groups mentioned would have to be considered in assigning this score. Thus, a respondent could answer question 12 by mentioning groups of Americans who have had some direct contact with his own country--f.i., "people who have visited my country," "American diplomats," or "American missionaries in my country." This kind of answer does not provide evidence for a very differentiated image of American society; it acknowledges that there are differences between different groups, but the specific ones mentioned do not represent important groupings in terms of which the American population is stratified. They are essentially logical categories that anyone (even in the absence of any knowledge about America) could have listed on the assumption that those who have had direct contact with a country will have different impressions from those who have had no such contact. Such groups, then, can be taken to indicate a relatively low degree of differentiation. A respondent might answer question 12 by mentioning groups that do reflect important bases for the stratification of the American population--such as "educated Americans" or "immigrants"--but that may still represent logical categories for answering the question. For example, it does not necessarily take a knowledge of American society to suggest that educated Americans will have different impressions of foreign countries than uneducated ones; or that immigrants will have different impressions than native-born Americans. The mention of such groups, then, can be taken to indicate a middle degree of differentiation. Finally, a respondent might answer question 12 by mentioning groups that represent important bases for the stratification of American society--such as groups defined in terms of regional differences, religious differences, ethnic differences, or occupational differences--and that cannot be expected to differ in their impressions of the respondent's country merely on logical grounds. The mention of such groups would reflect some detailed knowledge of American society and can be taken to indicate a relatively high degree of differentiation. Using these criteria, answers to question 12 were scored as follows: a score of 0 was assigned if the respondent indicated that he could think of no groups of Americans

differing in their impressions; a score of 1 if he mentioned only "low" groups (as defined above); a score of 2 if he mentioned only "middle" groups, or only middle and low groups; a score of 3 if he mentioned one "high" group; and a score of 4 if he mentioned two or more high groups.

(11) The rating of range of response to Question 12. This rating was based on the respondent's description of the ways in which the impressions of groups mentioned differed from those of the typical American (not simply on the number of groups mentioned).

(12) The rating of depth of response to question 12, again based on the description of the ways in which impressions differed.

(13) The rating of range of response to question 15b, which asked the respondent to discuss the kind of information that might be included in a feature program about the United States.

(14) The rating of depth of response to question 15b.

(15) An over-all rating of the respondent's degree of knowledgeability about the American scene, based on his responses to questions 4, 7, 11, and 15b. This rating represents, essentially, the extent to which the respondent describes the American scene in specific, concrete, factual terms, rather than in vague, abstract, stereotyped terms. To a large extent, this rating was based on the number of significant facts that the respondent included in his answers. Examples of "significant facts" would be the names and functions of specific broadcasting programs, organizations, and regulatory agencies; specific statements about major social problems in the U.S., such as the extent of poverty, the assimilation of various ethnic groups, the relations between the races; specific features of the American political system and its functions; specific features of various geographical regions in the U.S., such as their level of industrialization and urbanization; and concrete statements about American history and culture. In addition to the number of facts mentioned, the rating also took into account the quality of the responses. The ratings were done on a four-point scale. A rating of 1 represented responses given in vague, overly abstract, oversimplified, sterotyped terms, showing little or no knowledge of America. Such a rating was assigned to respondents who mentioned no significant facts. A rating of 2 represented responses in terms of broad generalities, which show some knowledge of America but not a very thorough one (assigned to respondents who mentioned one significant fact together with such general points as "commercialism in broadcasting"). A rating of 3 represented responses in terms of broad generalities, which do however evidence a good basic knowledge of America (assigned to respondents who mentioned two or three significant facts). Finally, a rating of 4 represented responses given in specific, concrete, factual terms (assigned to respondents who mentioned four or more significant facts).

Before turning to a discussion of the over-all index of change in differentiation, which was based on the fifteen codes that have just been described, let us examine the results obtained with each of the fifteen individual codes. These findings are summarized in

Table 11.1

Mean Before-, After-, and Change-Scores on each of the fifteen codes that enter into the index of change in differentiation of the image of America

| | Participants | | | | Comparison Group | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Codes* | N** | Before | After | Change | N** | Before | After | Change |
| (1) | 23 | 7.00 | 7.74 | .74 | 15 | 7.93 | 7.33 | -.60 |
| (2) | 19 | 2.37 | 2.37 | .00 | 13 | 2.08 | 2.00 | -.08 |
| (3) | 19 | 2.05 | 2.05 | .00 | 13 | 2.15 | 2.15 | .00 |
| (4) | 22 | 2.18 | 2.00 | -.18 | 15 | 1.93 | 1.80 | -.13 |
| (5) | 22 | 2.09 | 2.14 | .05 | 15 | 2.27 | 2.07 | -.20 |
| (6) | 13 | 2.08 | 2.85 | .77 | 15 | 2.13 | 2.07 | -.06 |
| (7) | 13 | 1.85 | 2.15 | .30 | 15 | 2.13 | 1.87 | -.26 |
| (8) | 23 | 2.52 | 2.61 | .09 | 18 | 2.50 | 2.17 | -.33 |
| (9) | 23 | 1.61 | 1.74 | .13 | 18 | 1.89 | 1.67 | -.22 |
| (10) | 19 | 1.47 | 2.00 | .53 | 13 | 1.31 | 1.69 | .38 |
| (11) | 15 | 1.73 | 2.07 | .34 | 11 | 1.82 | 2.27 | .45 |
| (12) | 15 | 1.67 | 1.87 | .20 | 11 | 1.91 | 2.09 | .18 |
| (13) | 19 | 2.00 | 2.58 | .58 | 16 | 2.38 | 2.44 | .06 |
| (14) | 19 | 1.68 | 1.84 | .16 | 16 | 1.62 | 1.62 | .00 |
| (15) | 22 | 1.73 | 2.23 | .50 | 19 | 2.16 | 2.26 | .10 |

* See text for description of these fifteen codes.

** The N's represent the number of respondents within a given group (participants or comparison group) who answered the question on which a particular code is based, both before and after.

Table 11.1, which presents--for each of the fifteen codes--the mean before-score, mean after-score, and mean change-score for both the participants and the comparison group. Looking first at the participants, we see that for twelve out of the fifteen comparisons, the after-score is higher than the before-score (indicating greater differentiation), for two it is the same, and for only one comparison it is lower. According to the sign-test (which is a very conservative statistical test) this pattern is significant at better than the .01 level of confidence. By contrast, for the comparison group the after-score is higher than the before-score in only five cases, the same in two, and lower in eight. This pattern does not depart significantly from chance.

The most relevant basis for evaluating the results presented in Table 11.1 is a comparison of the mean change scores obtained by participants and comparison group members on each of the fifteen codes. Such a comparison reveals that the mean change score of the participants is higher than that of the control group in twelve cases. (The higher the change score, the greater the increase in differentiation of the image of America.) Of these twelve codes, seven show fairly sizeable differences between the two groups: the score for the extent of difference in the respondent's characterization of TV in his own country and in the United States (1); the ratings of range and depth of discussion of the problems faced by American TV (6 and 7); the ratings of range and depth of discussion of the typical American's impression of the respondent's own country (8 and 9); the rating of range of information included in a hypothetical feature program about the United States (13); and the rating of knowledgeability about the American scene (15). On the remaining five of the twelve positive cases, the differences are small but in the expected direction. Finally, there is one case in which the mean change score is identical for the two groups, and two in which the comparison group has the higher score, although only by a very small margin. Altogether, this kind of pattern is statistically significant by the sign-test at better than the .01 level of confidence. From the item-by-item comparison, thus, we are clearly justified in concluding that the participants evinced a significantly greater increase in differentiation of their image of America than did the comparison group.

As mentioned above, responses to the fifteen codes were combined to yield an over-all index of change in differentiation for each respondent. The scoring procedure on this index was as follows: for each of the fifteen codes, we noted whether the respondent showed a positive change, a negative change, or no change from the before- to the after-questionnaire. The number of positive changes minus the number of negative changes constitute the respondent's score. Thus, a respondent who changed positively on eight codes, negatively on three codes, and not at all on four codes would receive a score of 8-3, or 5. For those respondents who failed to answer some of the questions and who could therefore not be coded on all fifteen items, the score was corrected appropriately. Thus, a respondent for whom only ten codes were ascertainable, and who changed positively on six, negatively on two, and not at all on two, would receive a score of 6-2x15/10, or 6. In other words, the scores were computed on the assumption that the proportion of positive and negative changes on the missing codes would have been the same as on the existing ones. (2)

The mean score on this over-all index for the 27 participants on whom data were available was 2.56. The mean score for the 20 members of the comparison group on whom data were available was -.60. Thus, the participants do show an increase in differentiation. The controls, on the other hand, actually show a slight decrease on the average. In order to test the significance of this finding, we first examined the scores of each group separately. Of the 27 participants, seventeen had positive scores (indicating an over-all increase in differentiation from before to after), five had scores of zero, and five had negative scores. By the sign-test, this pattern is significant at the .01 level of confidence. Of the 20 controls, only six had positive scores, three had zero scores, and eleven had negative scores. The trend here is obviously in the direction of negative change, though not significantly so.

Again, the most relevant basis for evaluating these results is the comparison between participants and their comparison group. In order to be able to apply the sign-test, we used, for the purposes of this comparison, only those 20 participants for whom we had individual controls. Table 11.2 presents 20 pairs of scores on our index, each pair consisting of the scores of a participant and of the comparison group member who matches him most closely. In all cases, the comparison group member is from the same country as the participant; and within each country matching was done in terms of nature and level of professional position. The pairs are arranged by continent of residence. Inspection of the table reveals that in sixteen of the 20 pairs, the participant has a higher score than his control; in three pairs the scores are identical; and in only one pair is the participant's score lower than that of his control. This pattern of scores is statistically significant, by the sign-test, at better than the .01 level of confidence.

In sum, the results suggest very clearly that the participants in the Seminar developed more complex and differentiated images of America and of American broadcasting. Results from the comparison group permit us to conclude that these changes in the participants were indeed caused by their experience in America, which intervened between the first and second questionnaires.

---

(2) In order to make certain that the correction procedure did not produce any systematic biases, all of the comparisons between participants and comparison group to be reported here were also made with the use of uncorrected scores--i.e., scores based on the number of positive changes minus the number of negative changes, regardless of the total number of codes involved. These analyses yielded precisely the same conclusions as those reported below.

## Table 11.2

## Scores on the index of change in differentiation in the image of America for individual participants and their matching controls from the comparison group

| | Participants | Controls |
|---|---|---|
| Africa | 8 | 8 |
| | 8 | -8 |
| | 6 | -2 |
| | 5 | -3 |
| | 0 | -1 |
| | 0 | -3 |
| | -1 | 8 |
| Asia | 9 | 6 |
| | 8 | 0 |
| | 5 | 3 |
| | 4 | 3 |
| | 4 | 1 |
| | 2 | -5 |
| | 1 | 0 |
| | 1 | -5 |
| | -1 | -1 |
| Europe | 2 | 0 |
| | 0 | -2 |
| | 0 | -9 |
| | -2 | -2 |

## Additional Changes in Attitude in Various Areas

In addition to the changes in differentiation of the image of America, a number of other findings emerge from the comparison between participants and controls. These additional findings must be viewed cautiously since they represent a relatively small number of systematic differences out of a large number of comparisons. Nevertheless, an examination of these findings can give us at least suggestive evidence about the nature of the changes produced by participation in the Seminar.

### Views of American Broadcasting

We shall examine first changes in the content of respondents' views of American broadcasting, as revealed by their answers to questions 2, 4, and 7; and then changes in their evaluation of American broadcasting.

On question 2, the over-all amount of change in respondents' views of the actual pattern of activities in American TV is greater for participants than it is for controls (means of 4.57 vs. 3.56), although the difference between the two groups is not significant by the sign-test. Examination of the individual activities, however, reveals an interesting and consistent trend: for ten out of the thirteen activities, the participants show a decline in their rating of importance--i.e., they are less likely to regard it as a major activity on the after-questionnaire than on the before-questionnaire; for one activity there is no change; and for two the change is in the positive direction. Most of the changes are small, but the trend is very consistent; with ten out of twelve changes going in one direction, it is significant at the .05 level by the sign-test. In contrast, for the comparison group five changes are negative and six positive--a clearly non-significant pattern. If we compare the mean changes for participants and controls on each activity we find that in eleven out of the thirteen comparisons the participants show more negative (or less positive) change than the controls--which, again, is significant at the .05 level. The two major exceptions to the participants' tendency to rate activities as less important on the after- than on the before-questionnaire are "Providing popular entertainment" and "Selling products and services." These are rated as "major activities" on the after-questionnaire by every participant (and, for that matter, by every member of the comparison group).

Question 2 also provided information on the respondents' views of the ideal pattern of activities for American TV. Here again, changes are small but consistent: for ten out of the thirteen activities, participants show positive change--i.e., they are more likely to say on the after- than on the before-questionnaire that they think these activities should receive more emphasis; for two activities they show no change; and for only one activity ("Selling products and services") they show negative change--i.e., an increased preference for less emphasis. This pattern is significant at the .05 level. By contrast, the comparison group shows five negative, four positive, and four zero changes. If we compare the mean changes for participants and controls on each activity we find that in twelve out of the thirteen comparisons the participants show more positive (or less negative) change--which is significant at the .01 level. In short, responses to question 2 reveal a tendency for participants to conclude (a) that most potential TV activities do not receive as much emphasis in America as they had originally thought; and (b) that these activities should receive more emphasis than they do now. The interpretation of this finding is ambiguous. It certainly suggests an increased familiarity with American TV on the part of the participants, which would be consistent with the earlier finding of increased complexity and differentiation. Whether it also means some increased dissatisfaction with American TV cannot be determined on the basis of these data alone.

Turning to question 4, we find that the participants show more over-all change than the controls in their views of how American experiences in broadcasting might be instructive to broadcasters in their own countries. We are referring here to the difference in amount of change per se, regardless of direction--i.e., regardless of whether the change represents an increase or a decrease in the respondent's feeling that American broadcasting has positive contributions to offer. (The latter will be discussed below, when we turn to changes in evaluation of American broadcasting.) Responses to question 4 indicating that the respondent felt his own country could benefit from certain American experiences were categorized in terms of ten content areas (e.g., "Program standards," "Technical"). For nine out of these ten areas, participants showed more change from the before- to the after-questionnaire than did controls. Responses indicating that the respondent felt his own country should avoid certain American experiences were categorized in terms of eight content areas. For seven out of these eight areas, participants showed more change than controls. Both of these differences are significant at the .05 level, permitting us to conclude that the amount of reorganization (of whatever kind) of participants' views of American broadcasting was greater than that of the controls.

This reorganization is particularly marked for two substantive areas: (a) "Presentation style," which includes such matters as methods of presenting programs, announcing techniques, use of commercials. Of the sixteen participants who responded to the question, ten showed some change within this area, as compared to four out of thirteen controls. (b) "Ownership and control of broadcasting system," which concerns primarily the question of commercial vs. public ownership of stations and sponsorship of programs. In this area, eleven out of the sixteen participants showed some change, as compared to two out of the thirteen controls. More than half of these changes, incidentally, take the form of a decreased emphasis on the need to avoid American experiences in ownership and control. Many of the participants started with a negative attitude toward commercial broadcasting. It is unlikely that the observed change reflects a newly acquired preference for this type of system, but it probably does reflect the development of a less stereotyped image of it. In short, answers to question 4 indicate that the Seminar has produced some reorganization of the participants' views of American broadcasting and its relevance to their own countries, and possibly some abandonment of stereotyped images insofar as these were present at all.

In response to question 7, participants show an increase in enumeration of separate problems that they see American TV facing today. On the before-questionnaire the average number of content areas (i.e., coding categories) within which participants mention problems is 2.31, on the after-questionnaire 2.92. The mean change, thus, is .61. By contrast, the mean change for controls is -.29 (from 2.50 to 2.21). When we examine the ten content areas individually, we find that the proportion of participants who mention problems increases (from before- to after-questionnaires) in six areas, remains unchanged in two, and decreases in two. Comparing participants with controls, we find that the increase in the proportion of participants who mention problems in a given area is greater than that of the controls in eight out of the ten cases (a difference that just falls short of significance by the sign-test). The differences between participants and controls are especially marked in two areas: "Program standards" and "Educational broadcasting." On the other hand, there is a marked reversal of the general trend in the area of "Purpose and function of broadcasting in the society." There is a decrease in the proportion of participants who mention problems in this area, but not in the proportion of controls.

The interpretation of the general trend for participants to show an increase in the number of problem areas perceived is ambiguous. It could be interpreted to mean that, as a result of their exposure to American TV, the participants regard it as more problem-ridden than they did before. This, however, is by no means the only interpretation possible. We are more inclined to the view that this change is a consequence of their greater familiarity with American broadcasting, coupled with the fact that the Seminar encouraged a more analytical approach to broadcasting and its problems in general. Consistent with the last point is the finding, to be reported below, that the participants show an increase in the number of problem areas perceived, not only with respect to American broadcasting, but also with respect to their own broadcasting systems.

Participants also show an increase, in response to question 7, in the number of content areas within which they mention causes of the problems faced by American TV. The increase in the proportion of participants who mention causes in a given content area is greater than the increase in the proportion of controls in seven out of ten comparisons. The largest difference occurs in the area of "Financial limitations": there is a 46% increase in the number of participants who mention inadequate financial resources as a cause of problems faced by American TV, as compared to a 23% decrease in the number of controls who mention this cause. This finding is particularly interesting since it represents another change in a commonly held stereotype. Many participants assumed, when they first came to the U.S., that American TV operates with unlimited financial resources, but learned that this was far from true--particularly in educational stations and local commercial stations.

Taken together, the findings so far seem to justify the conclusion that the participants experienced a greater reorganization in the content of their views of American broadcasting than did the comparison group. There are several indications that this reorganization is related to greater familiarity with American broadcasting, which led to a filling-in of details and an abandonment of certain stereotyped conceptions. These findings are in line with the observed increase in complexity and differentiation of the image of America and American broadcasting, discussed in the preceding section. The increase in the tendency of participants (as compared to controls) to say that most potential TV activities should receive more emphasis in America, and to perceive different problems faced by American TV, is consistent with this interpretation. It may also reflect, however, some changes in the evaluation of American broadcasting. To explore this possibility, we shall now turn to those data that bear more directly on the evaluative dimensions.

Six codes provide information relevant to the evaluative dimension. Scores derived from these codes are presented in Table 11.3. The first three of the codes listed in the table are based on answers to question 4, which called for respondents' views of how American experiences in broadcasting might be instructive to broadcasters in their own countries. We find, first, that participants show a slight increase in their perception of separate areas in which their own broadcasting systems could benefit from American experiences; controls show a slight decrease. Participants also show a small increase in their perception of areas in which their own broadcasting systems should avoid American experiences (in which, presumably, they do not want to repeat American mistakes); but the controls show a larger increase on this code. Thus, both participants and controls change in the negative direction on this item, but the participants' negative change is smaller. The coders also rated responses to question 4 on the over-all extent to which the respondent indicates that American experiences have a potential contribution to make to broadcasting in his own country. Ratings were done on a four-point scale, ranging from "no contribution" (a rating of 1) to "major contribution" (a rating of 4). On this rating, participants show a small increase from before- to after-questionnaire, while controls show a small decrease. Thus, on all three of the codes that relate to the potential contribution of American experiences, the differences between participants and controls are quite small, but consistent in direction: in each case, participants become more positive (or less negative) than controls toward the possibility of contributions from American broadcasting. It seemed appropriate, therefore, to devise an index of change in perceived contribution from American broadcasting based on these three items. To construct this index, a value of +1 was added to a respondent's score for each of the following: an increase in number of areas in which he mentions benefits from American experiences, a decrease in number of areas in which he mentions that American experiences should be avoided, and an increase in the coder rating of perceived contribution. A value of -1 was added to a respondent's score for a change in the opposite direction on each of these three codes. Mean scores on this index were .06 for participants and -.69 for controls. Thus, it can be said that participants did not show the decline in perceived contribution of American broadcasting evinced by the comparison group. When participants are compared to their matching controls on this index, we find more positive (or less negative) change for the participant in six out of eight pairs. (3) This difference falls short of statistical

---

(3) There are only eight pairs because of frequent failures to respond to question 4. Whenever either member of the pair (participant or control) fails to answer a question on either of the two questionnaires, this pair must be omitted from any comparison based on that particular question.

## Table 11.3

Mean before-, after-, and change-scores on each of 6 codes relevant to the evaluation of American Broadcasting

| Codes | Participants N | Participants Before | Participants After | Participants Change | Comparison Group N | Comparison Group Before | Comparison Group After | Comparison Group Change |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| (1) Number of content areas within which respondent feels his own broadcasting system could benefit from American experiences (question 4) | 16 | 2.44 | 2.50 | .06 | 13 | 2.08 | 1.92 | −.16 |
| (2) Number of content areas within which respondent feels his own broadcasting system should avoid American experiences (question 4) | 16 | 1.06 | 1.25 | .19 | 13 | .23 | .77 | .54 |
| (3) Coder rating of extent of perceived contribution of American broadcasting (question 4) | 17 | 3.00 | 3.12 | .12 | 13 | 3.08 | 2.92 | −.15 |
| (4) Coder rating of degree of favorableness of respondent's general attitude toward American TV (question 4, 6, and 7) | 20 | 3.05 | 2.75 | −.30 | 17 | 2.76 | 2.65 | −.11 |
| (5) Respondent rating of extensiveness of coverage of information about his own country by American mass media (question 10a) | 24 | 2.50 | 2.17 | −.33 | 17 | 2.12 | 2.29 | .17 |
| (6) Respondent rating of accuracy of coverage of information about his own country by American mass media (question 10b) | 24 | 3.08 | 2.79 | −.29 | 17 | 2.65 | 2.76 | .11 |

significance by the sign-test, but there is a definite trend for participants (as compared to controls) to show a more positive evaluation of the potential contributions of American experiences to broadcasting in their own countries.

The other three codes presented in Table 11.3, however, reveal a rather different picture. One of these codes is based on an over-all rating, by the coders, of the degree of favorableness in each respondent's general attitude toward American TV. This rating is based on responses to questions 4, 6, and 7, and was made on a five-point scale ranging from "American TV is viewed in extremely unfavorable terms" (a rating of 1) to "American TV is viewed in extremely favorable terms" (a rating of 5). The remaining two codes are based on pre-coded questions (10a and 10b) designed to assess respondents' satisfaction with the way American mass media cover information about their own countries. Each item was scored on a five-point scale, with a score of 1 assigned to the responses "Not extensive at all" and "Not accurate at all," and a score of 5 assigned to the responses "Very extensive" and "Very accurate." These two codes are on a rather different level from the others, in that they do not call for an evaluation of American broadcasting as such, in terms of its own contributions and accomplishments, but for an evaluation of how well American broadcasting (along with the other mass media) handles a specific task: coverage of information about each respondent's home country. This kind of evaluation represents not merely a professional judgment, but also a highly personal one, insofar as we can assume that the treatment accorded to a visitor's nation carries much personal significance for him. An examination of Table 11.3 reveals that on both of the codes dealing with the respondent's evaluation of the media coverage of his own country, as well as on the rating of over-all favorablenss toward American TV, the participants change in the negative direction. The comparison group also shows a negative mean change on the rating of favorableness, but a smaller one; and small positive changes on the other two codes. Thus, on all three of these measures the participants showed a greater decline in positive evaluation than did the controls. The three codes were combined into an index of change in satisfaction with American broadcasting. For each respondent, a score was computed by assigning +1 for a positive change on any of the three codes and -1 for a negative change. Mean scores on this index were -.71 for participants and .35 for controls. When participants are compared to their matching controls, we find that participants have the lower scores (i.e., more negative or less positive change) in ten out of thirteen pairs. This difference just falls short of significance at the .05 level by a two-tailed sign-test. It certainly suggests, however, that there is at least a small tendency for the participants' satisfaction with American media to decline.

None of the findings presented in Table 11.3 is clear and strong. They do, however, represent some trends with rather interesting implications. It would seem that the participants' evaluation of American broadcasting does not change along a single dimension. The direction of change depends on the particular measure used. On the one hand, they tend to become somewhat less satisfied with American broadcasting; but on the other hand, they tend to become somewhat more inclined to see American broadcasting as a potential source of valuable contributions to their own broadcasting systems. There is certainly no necessary contradiction between these two findings. As a visitor becomes more familiar with American broadcasting, he may find various features with which he is not particularly satisfied. Thus his post-experience reactions may contain more critical comments than his earlier reactions. This would be particularly likely to happen with respect to matters about which he himself is very knowledgeable and in which he is personally involved--such as the information about his own country transmitted by American media. To some extent, the decline in satisfaction may simply reflect a greater willingness to be critical now that he has had the opportunity to make personal observations. Yet, at the same time, the increased familiarity with American broadcasting may increase his awareness of procedures and approaches that might be quite valuable in his own situation. Thus, even though he does not like everything about American broadcasting, he comes to see it as a more useful source of relevant contributions. It may not be too far-fetched to compare this pattern to the experience of an advanced student as he becomes more fully initiated into a specialized field of knowledge: his general satisfaction with the field may decline, because he becomes more aware of its failures and limitations; but at the same time his perception of the potential contributions of the field may increase, because he has a more intimate acquaintance with the accumulated data and the available methods. If this analysis is correct, then it has some definite implications for the evaluation of international exchange programs. It suggests that one can easily draw the wrong conclusion about the effects of a program if one relies on a single measure of "favorableness"; and that a global increase in favorableness is not necessarily the most desirable outcome.

## Views of America and Americans in General

The major source of information about changes in the content of respondents' views of America is question 15b, in which they were asked what information might be included in a feature program about the United States. The responses to this question were coded in terms of thirteen content categories. There appears to be a tendency for the comparison group to show a greater increase (from before- to after-questionnaires) in the number of content categories covered by their responses than the participants. The participants mention, on the average, 3.00 areas in the before-questionnaire and 3.33 in the after-questionnaire, an increase of .33. The comparable figures for the controls are 2.86 and 4.00, an increase of 1.14. The difference is not statistically significant, however. The greater increase for the controls holds true in only seven out of the thirteen content areas; and in six out of nine matched pairs of participants and controls. An examination of the specific areas reveals that the biggest difference between participants and controls occurs in the probability of mentioning "Degree of cultural diversity." Controls mention this point more often on the after- than on the before-questionnaire, but this change is not matched by the participants. Differences in the same direction, but of smaller magnitude, are found in three other areas: "Degree of national integration," "Political life," and "Organization of economic life." On the other hand, controls show a sizeable decrease in the mention of "Cultural aspects," which covers a wide range of features of American society, including education, religion, the arts, the mass media, and well-known personalities. These findings are very difficult to interpret. They seem inconsistent with our earlier finding (see Table 11.1) that the participants show a greater increase in the range of their responses to question 15b. It may be that the participants mention fewer areas in their after-questionnaire responses than the controls, but that within these areas their responses are more specific and detailed. It must also be kept in mind that we are dealing with a difference that is not statistically significant and could thus represent a chance variation.

It is interesting that a similar pattern is revealed in responses to question 13, which asked what information should be included in an American feature program about the respondent's own country. These responses were coded in terms of the same thirteen content categories as question 15b. The participants show a decline in the number of content categories covered by their responses, from an average of 4.50 before to 3.83 after--thus, a mean change of −.67. (In seventeen out of twenty-two cases, change is in the negative direction.) The controls show a small increase, from 4.89 to 5.26, or a mean change of .37. Again, the difference is not statistically significant. The greater increase for the controls holds true in eight out of the thirteen content areas; and in nine out of fourteen matched pairs of participants and controls. Differences occur particularly in three areas: "National status," which deals mainly with the country's international position and activities; "Social welfare"; and "Organization of economic life." Participants are less likely to mention these areas for inclusion in a feature program about their own countries on the after- as compared to the before-questionnaire. Controls, on the other hand, are likely to change in the opposite direction. Again, there seems to be no obvious interpretation of these findings. One possible explanation is suggested by the specific areas that account for most of the decline in the participants' mean number of areas: perhaps the participants become more sensitive to aspects of their own countries that might be considered controversial in the United States (e.g., any indications of neutralism or socialism) and therefore deemphasize these aspects in the proposed feature program. There is, however, no independent evidence for this interpretation and it represents nothing more than a tentative speculation.

Let us turn now to data bearing on the evaluative dimension of respondents' views of America and Americans. Five codes are relevant to this dimension and mean scores derived from these codes are presented in Table 11.4. The first three codes are ratings based on responses to question 11, which asked how the typical American would describe the respondent's own country. From these responses, it was possible to infer the respondent's attitudes toward Americans in a specific context: Americans as they observe and relate to the respondent's own country. We have no way of knowing to what extent these attitudes can be generalized to other contexts for viewing Americans, but it seems reasonable to assume that a foreign visitor's general attitude toward his hosts will be strongly colored by his perception of the hosts' attitude toward the visitor's own country. Respondents' views of Americans were coded on three five-point scales: the degree to which Americans are seen as well-informed and knowledgeable about the respondent's own country (from 1 for "very ignorant" to 5 for "very well-informed and knowledgeable"), as sympathetic to the respondent's country (from 1 for "very unsympathetic" to 5 for

## Table 11.4

Mean before-, after-, and change-scores on each of 5 codes relevant to the evaluation of America and Americans

| Codes | Participants |  |  |  | Comparison Group |  |  |  |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|  | N | Before | After | Change | N | Before | After | Change |
| (1) Coder rating of degree to which the "typical American" is described as well-informed and knowledgeable about the respondent's own country (question 11) | 23 | 2.74 | 3.09 | .35 | 17 | 2.53 | 2.18 | -.35 |
| (2) Coder rating of degree to which the "typical American" is described as sympathetic to the respondent's own country (question 11) | 23 | 3.43 | 3.39 | -.04 | 17 | 3.00 | 2.76 | -.24 |
| (3) Coder rating of degree to which the "typical American" is described as accepting the respondent's own country on equal terms (question 11) | 23 | 3.00 | 2.96 | -.04 | 17 | 2.77 | 2.71 | -.06 |
| (4) Coder rating of degree of favorableness of respondent's general attitude toward America (questions 4, 7, 11, and 15b) | 23 | 3.09 | 3.26 | .17 | 19 | 3.11 | 2.90 | -.21 |
| (5) Respondent rating of adequacy of coverage of information about the U.S. by the mass media of his own country (question 15a) | 28 | 2.50 | 2.71 | .21 | 20 | 2.15 | 2.60 | .45 |

"very sympathetic"), and as prepared to accept the respondent's country on equal terms (from 1 for "low in acceptance, patronizing" to 5 for "high in acceptance"). On the first of these three dimensions, there is a marked difference between participants and controls: participants become more favorable in their evaluation on the after-questionnaire, while the comparison group becomes less favorable. On the second dimension, the difference is in the same direction but much smaller: controls again change in the negative direction, but participants show practically no change. On the third dimension there is no noticeable change for either group. An index combining these three ratings was constructed by adding +1 to a respondent's score for each positive change and -1 for each negative change. The mean score for participants on this index is .09, and for controls -.35. When participants are compared to their matched controls, the participants have larger change scores in ten cases and smaller ones in only three. This difference is significant by the sign-test at the .05 level. We are justified in concluding, then, that on the whole the participants' evaluation of Americans (at least within the context presented by question 11) becomes relatively more favorable as a consequence of their American experience.

The fourth code in Table 11.4 yields similar results. This is an over-all rating of the degree to which the respondent's general attitude toward America appears to be favorable. Ratings were based on answers to questions 4, 7, 11, and 15b, and were made on a five-point scale ranging from 1 for "America is viewed in extremely unfavorable terms" to 5 for ". . . . extremely favorable terms." On the average, participants change in the direction of a more favorable evaluation, while controls change in the opposite direction. When participants are compared to their matched controls, they show more favorable change in eight pairs, less favorable change in three. This difference is not quite significant by the sign-test, but certainly a strong trend. The final code presented in Table 11.4 is based on a pre-coded question (15a), in which respondents were asked to judge the adequacy of information about the U.S. provided by their own mass media. The relevance of this question to the evaluative dimension is only indirect. It can be assumed that, other things being equal, a respondent who is more favorably inclined toward America will be less satisfied with the information about America presented by the mass media--i.e., will be more likely to feel that the information is incomplete and perhaps distorted. Even though this effect is likely to be overshadowed by other considerations, it is interesting to examine just what results this code has yielded. Responses were scored from 1 for "not too adequate" to 4 for "very adequate." As can be seen from Table 11.4, both participants and controls change in the direction of greater satisfaction with the adequacy of information about the United States. However, the mean change of the participants is smaller than that of the controls--i.e., their satisfaction does not increase by quite as much. When participants are compared with their matched controls, we find that they have smaller change scores in eight of the pairs and larger ones in four. This difference is not significant by the sign-test. Nevertheless, the direction of the difference is consistent with the other findings of Table 11.4 in that it suggests that participants become relatively more favorable in their evaluation of America as a consequence of their participation in the Seminar.

In sum, whatever information we have on general images of America and Americans seems to suggest that the participants' experience in America leads not only to more complex and differentiated images, but also to a generally more favorable evaluation. This, of course, must not be taken to mean that they have no criticisms of American life, but only that they tend, on the whole, to see it in a more positive light.

## Views of Broadcasting in the Respondent's Own Country

As might be expected, the content of participants' views of broadcasting in their own countries undergoes less change than the content of their views of American broadcasting. There are some changes, however, and they seem to parallel changes found with respect to American broadcasting.

Answers to question 1 reveal a slight, though non-significant trend for participants' ratings of the extent to which their own TV systems stress various activities to decline. Of the thirteen activities listed, participants' ratings decrease in six--i.e., they are less likely to regard these as major activities on the after- than on the before-questionnaire--and increase in three; there is no change in the remaining four. For the comparison group, there are four negative, six positive, and three zero changes. When the mean changes of participants and controls on each activity are compared, we find that the participants have lower scores in eight activities and higher ones in four. The specific activity in which the contrast between participants and controls is most marked is "Providing information about other countries": Participants are less likely to mention this as a major activity on the after- than on the before-questionnaire; controls change in the opposite direction. There is also a sizeable difference between the two groups on two other activities: "Contributing to the creation and maintenance of national loyalty" and "Providing a forum for political discussion." In sum, it would seem that participation in the Seminar may have led some individuals to reexamine their own TV systems and to conclude that some of the potential TV activities do not receive as much emphasis in their own countries as they had originally thought. While the pattern revealed by our findings is not statistically significant, it is of interest because it is similar to the pattern obtained in question 2, the parallel question dealing with American broadcasting. This allows us to place some of the findings with regard to American broadcasting in perspective by suggesting that they may derive--at least in part--from a broader process of rethinking of professional issues stimulated by the Seminar.

Question 8 also yields some results that are similar to those obtained on the parallel question dealing with American TV. In response to question 7, as we have seen, participants show an increase in the enumeration of separate problems that they see American TV facing today. They show a similar increase in response to question 8, which deals with the problems faced by TV in their own countries. On the before-questionnaire, the average number of content areas (coding categories) within which participants mention problems is 2.64, on the after-questionnaire 3.09. Their mean change, thus, is .45. The comparable figures for the controls are

3.16 and 2.74, yielding a mean change of -.42. When we compare participants and controls, we find that the increase in the proportion of participants who mention problems is greater for seven out of eleven content areas. This difference is not significant by the sign-test. The one area in which the difference between participants and controls is especially marked is "Public taste," which includes all matters pertaining to audience preferences and reactions. Despite the fact that the pattern of change as a whole is not statistically significant, the fact that it yields trends in the same direction as question 7 is of some interest, as we have already noted. It is at least consistent with our earlier suggestion that the increased perception of problems faced by American TV may be in part a product of the more analytical approach to broadcasting problems in general stimulated by participation in the Seminar.

Another finding based on question 8 can be mentioned here. There is a small, but non-significant tendency for participants to show an increase in the number of content areas within which they propose solutions to the problems faced by TV in their own countries. The number of participants proposing a particular type of solution increases in eight of the eleven content categories in terms of which proposed solutions were coded. The controls show an increase in only four areas. When participants and controls are compared, we find that the increase in the proportion of participants who propose a given type of solution is greater than the increase in the proportion of controls in seven out of the eleven content areas. The areas in which the difference is greatest are "National development" and "More capital." That is, participants become relatively more likely to suggest that some general developments in the society as a whole and an increase in available funds are necessary for the solution of problems faced by TV in their own countries. On the other hand, participants become less likely to mention "Improved program standards" as a solution, while controls become more likely to do so. (4) This category refers to changes within the broadcasting system itself, such as improving the quality of programs, presenting a wider range of views, devoting more time to planning, etc. Thus, it would seem that participants become more inclined to seek solutions in the wider social context rather than in the internal operations of their broadcasting systems.

Finally, participants show an increase in the range of their responses to question 8, while the comparison group shows a decrease. When participants are compared with their matched controls, we find a greater increase in the rating of range received by participants in nine pairs, a smaller increase in two, and no difference in five. This pattern is significant at the .05 level, and suggests an increase in complexity and differentiation of the participants' views of broadcasting in their own countries. There is no comparable difference between the two groups, however, in the ratings of depth of responses to question 8.

---

(4) It is interesting that the opposite pattern emerges from responses to question 7: the proportion of participants who propose "Improved program standards" as a solution to problems faced by American TV increases; the proportion of controls who offer this solution decreases.

Let us turn now to data based on question 3 which have some bearing on respondents' evaluation of broadcasting in their respective countries. Question 3 asked about the experiences in broadcasting in the respondent's own country that might be instructive to broadcasters in other countries. Answers were coded in terms of the same ten categories used to code responses to question 4. Participants showed a small decrease in the number of content areas within which they feel other broadcasting systems could benefit from their own countries: the mean number of areas mentioned on the before-questionnaire is 2.32, on the after-questionnaire 2.16, with a mean change of -.16. The controls, on the other hand, show an increase of .47, from 1.80 to 2.27. When participants are compared with their matched controls, we find smaller change scores (i.e., greater decrease or smaller increase in number of areas mentioned) for participants in seven pairs, larger change scores in three pairs, and no difference in three pairs. Similarly, when we compare the two groups area by area, we find that there is a smaller increase (or greater decrease) in the proportion of participants who mention a given area than in the proportion of controls in seven cases; the reverse is true in two cases; and there is no difference in the tenth case. Neither of these comparisons yields differences that quite reach statistical significance by the sign-test, but a strong trend certainly emerges. It seems that participants, as compared to controls, change in the direction of perceiving fewer areas in which other broadcasters can benefit from the experiences of their own countries. This conclusion is also supported by the coder ratings of responses to question 3 on the over-all extent to which the respondent indicates that his own country has a potential contribution to make to broadcasting in other countries. Ratings were done on a four-point scale, ranging from 1 for "no contribution" to 4 for "major contribution." Participants show a small decline on this rating: from an average rating of 2.59 on the before-questionnaire to 2.50 on the after-questionnaire--a mean change of -.09. Controls show a small increase: from 2.33 to 2.53, or a mean change of .20. When participants are compared with their matched controls, we find lower change-scores for the participant in seven pairs, higher ones in three pairs, and no difference in three pairs. Again, this difference falls short of significance by the sign-test, but there seems to be a consistent though small tendency for participants to show a decline in the perceived contribution that their own country's broadcasting experiences can make to others.

It may be of interest to note that the greatest contrast between participants and controls is in the area of "Ownership and control of broadcasting system." There is little change altogether in this (or any other) area, and the difference between the two groups is marginal. But controls do tend to become more likely to see this as an area in which other broadcasters can benefit from the experiences of their own countries, while participants do not. We have already seen that, in their responses to question 4, participants become less likely to emphasize the importance of avoiding American experiences in ownership and control. Another trend, not mentioned before, is that participants (as compared to controls) become more likely, in response to question 8, to point to "Too much government intervention or political interference" as a cause of problems faced by TV in their own countries. Taken together, these different trends suggest that some of the participants have become less certain of the advantages of public ownership and the disadvantages of private ownership than they may have been before. There is no indication here of a major shift in attitude, even on the part of a small proportion of the participants, but simply an indication that they now see more pros and cons on both sides.

The general trend with respect to the participants' perceptions of the potential contributions of their own broadcasting systems probably reflects the shift in "certainty" that we have just noted. There is no indication that participants become generally more dissatisfied with their own systems. Change scores on a coder rating of degree of favorableness of respondent's general attitude toward his own TV system, for example, show no differences between participants and controls. Rather, it would seem, the participants become somewhat less certain of the advantages of their own systems relative to those of others. They may see some of their own procedures as representing one of a number of possible approaches to broadcasting, each of which has its own assets and liabilities. In particular, they may come to see that, while their own procedures may be ideally suited to their own circumstances, they may not be equally suited to the circumstances that prevail in other countries. As a result, they may become less certain of the benefits that others can derive from the experiences in their own countries--without, however, necessarily becoming less satisfied with their own procedures.

There is one other finding based on question 3 which appears somewhat paradoxical. On the rating of depth of responses to question 3, the participants show a decline from before- to after-questionnaire. Their mean change-score is -.36, compared to a mean of .07 for the comparison group. When participants are compared with their matched controls, we find lower change-scores (a greater decrease in rating of depth) in seven pairs, no difference in six pairs, and a higher score in only one pair. There is no difference between the two groups, however, on the rating of range of response. The only explanation of this finding that suggests itself is that participants' responses to question 3 have become less rich and detailed because--in line with our interpretation above--they have become less certain of the contributions their own broadcasting systems can make to others. Thus, they may be less inclined to dwell and elaborate on the potential contributions, which in turn would lead to a lower rating of depth.

In sum, the pattern of changes in participants' views of broadcasting in their own countries suggests that the Seminar has stimulated a certain amount of new thinking about the activities, problems, and values of their own broadcasting systems. In part, this probably reflects a process of examination and analysis of general issues in broadcasting, resulting from the observations and discussions in which the participants engaged. This interpretation is supported by the fact that some of the changes in participants' views of broadcasting in their own countries are closely parallel to changes in their views of American broadcasting. In part, changes in participants' views of their own broadcasting systems probably resulted from the opportunity to compare their own systems with those of other countries, including the United States. There is no indication that participants become generally less satisfied with their own systems as a result of such comparisons. They show no systematic decline in favorableness of their general attitude toward broadcasting at home. Moreover, they become more inclined to seek solutions for the problems of their own systems in the wider context within which these systems operate rather than in its internal procedures. But there is a definite indication that they become less certain of the contributions that their own systems can make to broadcasting in other countries. It would seem that they become more aware of the relative advantages and disadvantages of different approaches, and thus less convinced of the general applicability of some of their own procedures.

## Views of the Respondent's Own Professional Role

There is no indication, from question 20, of any major redefinition of their professional roles on the part of Seminar participants. Question 20 attempted to assess each respondent's definition of his profession by asking him to indicate the other professions to which it was most similar and least similar in various respects. A number of indices were developed to measure the amount of change in role definition revealed by answers to question 20. No consistent differences on these indices were found between participants and controls.

There is some tendency, however, for participants to show more change in their assessment of the importance of various activities that might be involved in their jobs. Question 16 asked respondents to rate each of ten activities as very important, somewhat important, slightly important, or not important to their jobs. A numerical value, ranging from 4 to 1, was assigned to each rating. By comparing the ratings on the before-questionnaire to those on the after-questionnaire, we obtained a measure of change (regardless of direction) for each activity. These were then summed, over the ten activities, to yield a total change-score for each individual. The mean change-score on this index is 5.18 for participants and 4.43 for the comparison group. When participants are compared to their matched controls, we find larger scores for the participants in twelve pairs, smaller scores in eight pairs, and no difference in one. When we compare the two groups activity by activity, we find that the participants' mean change-score is higher in six cases, lower in three cases, and the same in one. Neither of these comparisons yields a difference that is statistically significant by the sign-test, but there does seem to be a trend for the participants to change more in their perception of the activities that are associated with their jobs.

The specific activities for which the difference between participants and controls is greatest are "Public relations" and "The commercial side of communication." That is, in both of these areas, a large number of participants--relative to the number of controls--manifest some change, assigning either greater or lesser importance to these activities than they did on the before-questionnaires. Future analyses will reveal whether this difference reflects actual changes in the nature of the participants' activities, or changes in their perception of their activities. If it is the latter, then the above findings suggest one or both of the following possibilities. Comparison of their own activities with those of their American counterparts may have led to a change in their definitions of "public relations" and "the commercial side of communication," which in turn accounts for the change in their assessment of how much these activities are involved in their own work. Alternatively, comparison with their American counterparts may have led to a change in their evaluation of these activities, which in turn has caused them to place either more or less emphasis on them in their own work.

There is one other activity on which there is a fairly sizeable difference between participants and controls, although in this case the difference is not in the over-all amount of change, but in change in a particular direction. Participants tend to attach increasing importance to "Contact with international developments in communications" as an aspect of their job, while controls show no consistent change in this direction. This change may reflect formal changes in the nature of some participants' jobs, or changes in the way in which they carry out their jobs, or changes in their evaluation of the importance of this particular type of activity. In any event, it suggests that there is at least some change in the direction of internationalization of the participants' professional activities.

In sum, we have seen so far that there is some evidence of change in participants' views of their professional roles on the descriptive level. They show somewhat greater change in their perception of the activities that constitute their work than do the members of the comparison group, although the differences are by no means marked. What about changes, now, on the more personal, affective level? The most relevant question, in this connection, is question 17, which concerns respondents' satisfaction with their work. Analysis of responses to this question reveals no consistent differences between participants and controls in their degree of satisfaction with their work, or in the aspects of their work that provide them with the greatest satisfaction, or in the aspects of their work that cause them the most dissatisfaction.

An interesting difference does emerge, however, in responses to questions 18 and 19. Question 18 asks respondents to indicate what they hope to be doing in five years, under the best of circumstances. Question 19 asks them what they expect to be doing in five years, given the circumstances that are likely to prevail. Answers to question 18 were coded on a three-point scale of level of aspiration, with a rating of 1 representing the low end of the continuum and a rating of 3 the high end. Answers to question 19 were coded on a similar three-point scale of level of expectation. The congruity of hopes and expectations was also rated on a three-point scale, based on a comparison of answers to the two questions. A rating of 1 was assigned if a respondent's aspirations were much greater than his expectations, a rating of 2 if they were somewhat greater, and a rating of 3 if his aspirations and expectations were very close. Mean scores for participants and controls on these three codes are presented in Table 11.5. Changes are small, but on all three of these codes participants change in the positive direction, while the comparison group changes in the negative direction. The three codes were combined into an index of change in positive orientation toward the professional future. A score on this index was computed for each respondent by adding +1 for each of the three codes on

## Table 11.5

## Mean before-, after-, and change-scores on each of three codes relevant to the respondent's orientation toward his professional future

| Codes | Participants |  |  |  | Comparison Group |  |  |  |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|  | N | Before | After | Change | N | Before | After | Change |
| (1) Level of aspiration | 25 | 2.36 | 2.56 | .20 | 17 | 2.53 | 2.41 | −.12 |
| (2) Level of expectation | 23 | 1.87 | 1.91 | .04 | 16 | 1.75 | 1.56 | −.19 |
| (3) Congruity of aspiration and expectation | 23 | 2.17 | 2.39 | .22 | 15 | 2.07 | 2.00 | −.07 |

which he changed in the positive direction and -1 for each item on which he changed in the negative direction. Mean scores on this index are .35 for the participants and -.12 for controls. When participants are compared with their matched controls, we find higher scores for participants in eight pairs, lower scores in two pairs, and no difference in four pairs. This pattern barely misses statistical significance at the .05 level by the sign-test.

There seems to be sufficient justification for concluding that participants in the Seminar tend to become more positive in their orientation toward their own professional future. They show some increase (relative to the comparison group) in their level of aspiration, i.e., in the professional position that they hope to achieve and the scope and quality of the operation that they hope to be in charge of. At the same time, they show an increase in the congruity of hopes and expectations: they tend not only to increase in their level of aspiration, but also in their confidence that they will be able to achieve this level.

It must be stressed that this effect, like most other effects presented in this chapter, is of relatively small proportions. Only some of the participants change in the direction indicated, and those who do often change only to a small degree. When we state, on the basis of a comparison between participants and controls, that there is a statistically significant or near-significant difference, we are only saying that the participants as a group have shown a noticeable change on the dimension in question, which is most probably attributable to participation in the Seminar rather than to chance fluctuation. A change for the group as a whole can be significant, i.e., noticeable and consistent, without being large in absolute terms and without affecting every member of the group. What such a finding tells us, essentially, is that experiences of the type that were provided by participation in the Seminar are capable of producing this type of change. And this, it seems to us, is precisely what we need to know for purposes of evaluation. It goes without saying that not everyone will be affected to the same degree and in the same way--some individuals will change in some respects, and some in others; and that the questionnaire captures only a small part of the impact of the total experience.

# CHAPTER 12

# COMPARISON OF HIGH AND LOW DIFFERENTIATORS

We have seen that the major variable distinguishing participants from controls in their performance on the questionnaire is the degree of change in differentiation of their image of America and American broadcasting. Scores of participants on the index of change in differentiation that we constructed exceeded scores of the controls at better than the .01 level of confidence. Thus, at least in this instance, participation in an experience that involves exposure to and discussion of American broadcasting and American live in general is associated with an increase in the organized detail with which the participants think about these phenomena.

This outcome, at first blush, is less than startling. After all, it merely shows that one who has gone to America knows America in more detail than one who has not. On reflection, however, this seemingly obvious result becomes less inevitable. Alternative outcomes would have been equally plausible. For example, it is conceivable that broadcasting specialists (and other individuals in relatively high positions within their own societies) would already be so saturated with knowledge about America that an exchange program would add little to their image. If so, we would not have obtained the significant increase in differentiation revealed by the questionnaires. It is also conceivable that participants, either because of negative preconceptions about America, or because of bad experiences during their sojourn, might have avoided genuine exposure to the new information confronting them. They might have viewed America from a distance and in global terms, and thus again they would have failed to manifest a more differentiated image.

If, therefore, this increase in the differentiation with which participants view America and American broadcasting is not an obvious and necessary consequence of the visit, then it becomes an important target for further analysis. What is it about the experience and the individuals undergoing it that accounts for this outcome? What can we discover about the process whereby increasing differentiation takes place?

One way of approaching answers to these questions is to compare those individuals who show the most pronounced change on the dimension of differentiation with those who show the least change on this dimension. By examining the characteristics and the interview responses of those who show the change (as compared to those who do not) we can gain some insight into the determinants of this change--into what it is about these individuals, about the nature of their experiences, and about the way in which they respond to these experiences that might account for the effect. Such an analysis also provides some basis for inferences about the process whereby such changes take place, although of necessity these are of a speculative nature.

To find a basis for making the desired comparisons, we ordered the twenty-eight participants in terms of their index of change of differentiation. Eight participants were excluded because they either had scores too close to the median or had failed to answer enough of the relevant questionnaire items. This left ten individuals with high scores on the index, and ten with low scores. For ease of exposition we shall refer to them as High Differentiators and Low Differentiators, although it must be kept in mind that the distinction is based not on high vs. low differentiation in absolute terms, but on high vs. low change in differentiation. The mean score of High Differentiators on the index is +52; the mean score of Low Differentiators is -15. (1)

The High and Low Differentiators do not seem to differ from each other in terms of their initial level of differentiation on the questionnaire. For each participant, before-scores on the fifteen codes that are relevant to differentiation were summed. The mean score for the High Differentiators is almost identical to that for the Low Differentiators: 31.17 as compared to 31.71. By contrast, mean scores on the after-questionnaire are 38.97 and 29.58, respectively.

When we compare High and Low Differentiators in terms of their areas of specialization, we find a somewhat greater tendency for the Highs to be in educational broadcasting (6 Highs vs. 3 Lows). As for national origin, we were particularly interested in the distribution of Europeans and non-Europeans over the two groups. We shall spell out more fully in the next chapter that we are using the term "Europeans" in the present context not only for individuals who reside in Europe, but also for those who--while residing on other continents--are European in terms of their ethnic and cultural origin. "Non-Europeans," in this context, come from societies that are largely non-white and non-industrialized. Change in differentiation shows no strong relationship to European vs. non-European origin, but when we subdivide both Europeans and non-Europeans, an interesting pattern emerges:

| | High Differentiators | Low Differentiators |
|---|---|---|
| Europeans | | |
| From English-speaking countries | 6 | 0 |
| From non-English speaking countries | 0 | 4 |
| Non-Europeans | | |
| From African countries | 0 | 4 |
| From other countries | 4 | 2 |

We can see from the above table that all Europeans from English-speaking countries (among this group of twenty participants) turned out to be High Differentiators. All of the Africans and all of the Europeans from non-English speaking countries turned out to be Low Differentiators. The latter four individuals, incidentally, are all people who had at least some difficulty with the English language and expressed serious concern about their English-speaking capacity. This pattern of distribution suggests the possibility that increased differentiation may be related to the ease with which a visitor can enter into the give-and-take of a searching interaction with members of the host society. It may well be that marked increases in differentiation require conversations and encounters with Americans that go beyond superficial generalities and thus enable the newcomer to become aware of the wide variety of Americans and of the viewpoints they represent, and to share in the complex picture Americans have of their own culture. Such encounters can occur more easily when visitor and host share the same language and a similar culture; large cultural differences and language barriers--while they can certainly be overcome--may slow down or inhibit these encounters. If so, it is not surprising that the High Differentiators include those participants whose native language is English and who, coming from the British orbit, have the greatest cultural communality with their American hosts. The Low Differentiators, on the other hand, consist almost entirely of two sub-sets of individuals: those whose cultural background is most distant from that of their American hosts, and those who are somewhat handicapped by language problems.

---

(1) Scores for the High and Low Differentiators were checked to rule out the possibility that high or low change depended upon unusually low or high scores on the first administration of the questionnaire. Change scores were recalculated for all twenty, eliminating all items for which ceiling effects could be alleged; membership in the two groups did not change thereby.

These data suggest, then, one possible hypothesis about the sources of increased differentiation: that such changes occur as a result of searching, give-and-take interactions of the visitor with members of his host society; and that they are, therefore, more likely to occur where cultural and linguistic communalities facilitate such interactions. Let us keep this possibility in mind as a very tentative formulation while we examine the responses of the High and Low Differentiators to the various interviews.

In the sections that follow we shall present and discuss all of the codes on which there is at least a 30% difference between High and Low Differentiators. For example, on the basis of responses to some of the questions in the first interviews, the coders were asked to check whether a given participant had previously (i.e., before his present visit) considered coming to the United States. It turns out (see Table 12.1) that the coders check 'yes' for all ten of the High Differentiators and for only seven of the Low Differentiators. We have here, then, a 30% difference between the two groups--just large enough to meet our criterion for differences we consider worth noting. Given the extremely small size of our sample, a difference of 30% (which is a frequency difference of 3 cases) is very unstable and does not meet the conventional criteria of statistical significance. It would be a mistake, therefore, to draw any conclusions on the basis of a single item. Our purpose, however, is to examine clusters of items--within a given substantive domain--and to see whether they reveal a consistent pattern. Only if a whole set of items seem to fit with each other and to point in the same direction are we justified in concluding that there is a real difference between the two groups that we are comparing.

## Table 12.1

## EXPECTATIONS AND GOALS

Comparison of Participants who showed High and Low Increases in Differentiation in Before- and After-Questionnaires

| Items that Discriminate | Number of Participants Agreeing to Item | |
|---|---|---|
| | High Increase | Low Increase |
| **First Interview** | | |
| Academic sessions: | | |
| --will allow one to elaborate his conceptions of Americans | 6 | 3 |
| --will be professionally irrelevant | 4 | 7 |
| --will be difficult | 2 | 6 |
| --will be difficult because of poor grasp of English | 1 | 5 |
| Major accomplishment desired: increasing professional knowledge | 9 | 6 |
| Wants to find out: how high American living standard really is | 5 | 8 |
| Wants to verify ideas that: | | |
| --cover many areas | 2 | 6 |
| --are rather undifferentiated | 5 | 8 |
| Expects Seminar's multi-national composition to have adverse effects; feels diverse backgrounds may lower the level of discussion | 4 | 0 |
| Feels own professional skill will enable him to make a special contribution to the Seminar | 8 | 5 |
| Hopes trip around America will let him become better acquainted with the "average" American" | 1 | 6 |
| Knows exactly which places he wants to visit | 5 | 2 |
| Expects no trouble during travel period | 5 | 8 |
| Expects language problems | 1 | 4 |
| Plans to contact specific individuals in U.S. beside prior acquaintances | 9 | 6 |
| Expects to establish permanent contacts in America | 10 | 7 |
| Had special reasons to become informed about U.S. before coming over | 10 | 7 |
| Has previously considered coming to U.S. | 10 | 7 |
| Has wanted to come to U.S. to add to professional knowledge | 8 | 4 |
| Expects Seminar participation to result in promotion | 4 | 1 |

Table 12.1 (cont'd.)

## EXPECTATIONS AND GOALS

Comparison of Participants who showed High and Low Increases in Differentiation in Before- and After-Questionnaires

| | Number of Participants Agreeing to Item | |
|---|---|---|
| Items that Discriminate | High Increase | Low Increase |
| Second Interview | | |
| Two months of travel may not be enough | 3 | 0 |
| Lanugage inadequacies will cause trouble during travels | 0 | 3 |
| Eagerly anticipates professional activities of the travel period | 4 | 8 |
| Expects to gain practical experience during travel period by working at an American station | 4 | 7 |

## Expectations and Goals

Table 12.1 presents those discriminating items that deal with the expectations and goals with which participants approached the Seminar. Most items come necessarily from the first interview.

The High Differentiator, as compared to the Low, appears more likely to have come to America feeling himself a competent professional in search of a helpful professional experience. The High, we see, had previously wanted to come to the United States, specifically in order to add to his professional knowledge. His major goal for the present visit is the increase of his professional knowledge. He feels that his own skill is such that he can make a meaningful and unique contribution, as a professional, to the Seminar. Unlike the Low, he thinks that even the academic seminars will have professional relevance. He has his own suspicions about some of the other participants; he feels that they may not be quite up to his level. The multi-national character means that there are going to be people from a number of different backgrounds, and that, he fears, may mean that the level of discussion will be lower than he would like.

Moreover, the High Differentiator seems to have more of a sense that the sojourn should be tied overtly and carefully to his career future. One senses, perhaps, a bit of careful planning for advancement. Thus, the High arrives with plans to look up specific people in America whom he does not yet know and to establish permanent contacts, and is more likely to suggest that taking part in the Seminar could lead to promotion.

The two groups also seem to differ in the sophistication with which they consider becoming acquainted with America. The High Differentiator has already had special reasons to become informed about America before coming over. He expects that the academic seminars will help him to elaborate his conceptions. The Low has less specific and refined expectations. He wants to find out how high the American standard of living really is, and hopes to become acquainted with the average American. He wants to find out whether a lot of ideas he has about America are valid--ideas that cover many areas of life, but ideas that are rather undifferentiated.

Finally, we note that there are several members of the Low group who, on the first interview, express real qualms about their capacity in English and expect difficulty on that score.

This pattern of responses is consistent with the hypothesis that the High Differentiators come to their American experience with a greater degree of readiness to engage in searching, give-and-take interactions with members of the host societies and with fewer barriers to such interactions. They have greater self-confidence about their professional roles, which should make them more comfortable in their interactions with professional counterparts. They are more certain about what they want--both in terms of contacts and in terms of information--so that they ought to be able to connect more quickly with people they meet. They experience no language difficulty, and they seem to imply that they are bringing adequate background information to their experience, so that communication barriers are less likely to arise.

The last point suggests an additional factor that might account for the greater increase in differentiation among the Highs: There is at least a hint that they bring to the experience a better articulated framework about the United States and its broadcasting system, which helps them scan and assimilate new information more quickly and may thus account for their greater tendency to develop a more detailed and elaborated image. It should be noted that, at least according to whatever evidence we have, the Highs do not start out with a more differentiated image. But it may well be that they start out with a more fully developed framework for approaching America so that, once they are exposed to new information through observation and discussion, they can absorb it and integrate more readily. We shall return to this possibility in a later section.

One further difference between High and Low Differentiators seems to emerge from the questions about expectations and goals raised in the first interview. The High Differentiators seem to have more specific professional goals for their trip and higher expectations for its relevance and value to their own professional activities. Before we draw any inferences from this difference, however, let us note the small hints of an apparent reversal in this trend in the second interview. Five weeks after their arrival, the Low Differentiators seem to have greater expectations for the professional value of the remainder of their stay. We will be able to gain some understanding of what might account for this apparent shift and what relationship it might have to the difference between High and Low Differentiators when we examine the reactions of the two groups to the experience and its different aspects.

## Perceived Accomplishments and Satisfactions

To begin with, let us examine what the High and Low Differentiators feel they have accomplished. Table 12.2 presents the relevant discriminating items. It is readily apparent that something unexpected has happened during the encounter with America. The High Differentiators, who had arrived feeling professionally competent and eager for a keen professional experience, seem much less caught up in professional affairs than the Lows, who had arrived with a less confident self-evaluation and with more diffuse goals.

As early as the second interview one finds that it is the Low Differentiators for whom enjoyable and noteworthy experiences are found in professional encounters, while the Highs are more apt to be interested in the academic seminars and in interpersonal events that illumine the American environment. For some reason the expectations of the High Differentiator have not been fulfilled, and his attention has moved from the professional area (in which he had hoped for involving, relevant, and useful experiences) and redirected to the general American scene. The sessions held at the university clearly affected High and Low Differentiators differently, and this is reflected in their different expectations for the travel period, already noted in the last section (see Table 12.1).

Findings from the third interview seem somewhat less clear. High Differentiators are more likely to say that their most important single accomplishment during the travel period was in the

## Table 12.2

## PERCEIVED ACCOMPLISHMENTS AND SATISFACTIONS

Comparison of Participants who showed High and Low Increases in Differentiation in Before- and After-Questionnaires

| Items that Discriminate | Number of Participants Agreeing to Item<br>High Increase | <br>Low Increase |
|---|---|---|
| **Second Interview** | | |
| Most enjoyable experience: | | |
| --was in a professional area | 0 | 3 |
| --had to do with interpersonal aspects of the American environment | 6 | 3 |
| Most noteworthy experiences included: | | |
| --academic session | 5 | 1 |
| --professional speakers | 3 | 7 |
| Things have come up at home that make one wish that he were there | 5 | 1 |
| **Third Interview** | | |
| Important enjoyable experiences: | | |
| --included those that were professionally relevant | 6 | 9 |
| --included aspects of the physical environment | 9 | 2 |
| Most important single accomplishment: | | |
| --was in a professional area | 9 | 6 |
| --was in a nonprofessional area | 1 | 4 |
| Couldn't do all that had planned to during professional visits | 6 | 3 |
| Learned new approaches to programming | 0 | 3 |
| Made many new contacts that plan to maintain | 3 | 6 |
| Things have come up at home that make one wish that he were there | 2 | 5 |
| **Fourth Interview** | | |
| Most meaningful experiences included: | | |
| --exposure to new program ideas | 3 | 6 |
| --academic sessions | 4 | 0 |
| Accomplishments included: | | |
| --greater knowledge of America's institutional structure | 5 | 2 |
| --greater knowledge about TV in America | 3 | 6 |
| Has gained more sense of trans-national human communality, more ease in interaction with foreigners | 0 | 4 |
| Expects that American experiences: | | |
| --will have a significant effect on career | 1 | 4 |
| --may lead to transfer to different kind of job | 0 | 3 |

## Table 12.2 (cont'd.)

## PERCEIVED ACCOMPLISHMENTS AND SATISFACTIONS

### Comparison of Participants who showed High and Low Increases in Differentiation in Before- and After-Questionnaires

| Items that Discriminate | Number of Participants Agreeing to Item | |
|---|---|---|
| | High Increase | Low Increase |
| **Post-Return Interview** | | |
| American experience: | | |
| --has affected professional activities | 3 | 6 |
| --has enhanced professional skills | 4 | 8 |
| Upon return home, he introduced: | | |
| --extension of educational TV | 6 | 3 |
| --greater use of indigenous men and materials | 0 | 4 |
| Upon return, he encountered problems due to long absence | 1 | 4 |
| Plans for the future are unchanged | 6 | 3 |
| Accomplished, at Seminar, just what expected to | 7 | 4 |

professional area. On the other hand, Low Differentiators are more likely to cite professionally relevant experiences among their major sources of enjoyment, and to indicate that they have learned new approaches and made contacts that they hope to maintain. The High Differentiators also mention that they could not do all they had hoped to do during their professional visits. On balance, it seems that even during the travel period the High Differentiators were less positively oriented toward their professional experiences, even though they did cite some professional accomplishments. It may well be that they had professional experiences that they found fruitful, but not quite up to their expectations--which, we must recall, were higher than those of the Low Differentiators. This does not mean that they did not enjoy the travel period, but simply that their source of enjoyment tended to be less in the professional area. Thus, the High Differentiators are far more likely to cite aspects of the physical environment as important sources of enjoyment--which suggests a shift of focus from the professional aspects of the experience to other aspects, such as the touristic ones.

In the fourth interview, when participants were asked to evaluate their total experience, we have further evidence of such a shift. High Differentiators are less likely than Lows to cite exposure to new program ideas among their most meaningful experiences, but more likely to cite the academic seminars. They are less likely than Lows to include greater knowledge about American TV among their accomplishments, but more likely to include greater knowledge of American institutions. The reduced emphasis on the professional aspects of the experience is also evidence by the fact that the High Differentiators now are less likely than the Lows to feel that the experience will have a significant effect on their career or lead to a different kind of job. Lest we assume that for the Low Differentiator the experience was entirely a professional one, we should also note in Table 12.2 that a number of them (as compared to none of the Highs) report an increased sense of trans-national human communality and a greater ease in interaction with foreigners.(2)

When the participants had been home for nine months, it still was the Low Differentiators, more so than the Highs, who reported that the experience had affected their professional activities and had enhanced their professional skills. The High Differentiators were more likely to report than the Lows that they contributed to the extension of educational TV upon returning home, but then it must be recalled that more of the High Differentiators were professionally identified with educational TV. Interestingly enough, High Differentiators are more likely to say, in retrospect, that they accomplished at the Seminar just what they had expected to. This is surprising, since the other findings indicate that the High

---

(2) In this connection we must stress that the data reported in this chapter do not give a complete picture of what happened to the two groups, since it presents only items on which they differed from each other. Thus, for example, nine Low Differentiators included first-hand exposure to American life among their most meaningful experiences. This finding is not reported here, however, since a similar statement was made by eight of the High Differentiators.

Differentiators did not accomplish what they had hoped to in the professional sphere, although they were satisfied in other respects. One possibility, if our speculations are correct, is that they revised their expectations in midstream and that these newly developed expectations were indeed matched by their accomplishments.

The data presented in this section seems consistent with the following formulation, which can be checked against some of the data yet to be presented. The High Differentiators, who arrived with high professional expectations, tended to be disappointed by the professional part of their experience at the university. They therefore revised their goals and expectations, both for the remainder of their stay at the university and particularly for the travel period, and turned essentially to other pursuits. Specifically, they focused on American society and American life, and took an interest in learning more about these through seminars, personal observations, and discussions with Americans. This refocusing increased their satisfaction with the over-all experience considerably. (A small hint to that effect, which should not, however, be taken seriously without further supporting data, can be found in Table12.2. In the second interview, High Differentiators are more likely than Lows to indicate that they wish they were back home in view of things that had come up there. In the third interview, during the travel, the opposite relationship holds. If we can take this item as a projective indicator of satisfaction, it suggests that High Differentiators tended to be dissatisfied during the university phase, but considerably more satisfied during the travel phase.) Moreover, this turning away from a professional emphasis to an emphasis on American society would at least help to explain their increased differentiation of the image of America, given their readiness for such an effect.

The precise relationship between the professional disappointment that we are postulating and the observed increase in differentiation is, of course, impossible to establish from the present data. One could suggest the possibility of a direct causal connection: the High Differentiators, having come with great expectations and been disappointed, may have been especially motivated to find some compensation--some way of making the best of a bad situation; thus, they took a strong interest in learning about American society which, in turn--given their readiness to interact with Americans easily and a cognitive framework ready to assimilate the new information--led to greater differentiation. Conversely, one could argue that there is no causal connection at all: the very factors that predisposed the High Differentiators to develop more differentiated images also predisposed them to come with greater expectations and hence experience disappointment; the disappointment did not interfere with the differentiation process, but it also did not spur it on. We are inclined to feel that the relationship between the apparent professional disappointment of the High Differentiators and their increase in differentiation is somewhere between these two extremes. Given--according to our earlier formulation--their readiness to interact with Americans and their receptive framework, they would have focused their attention equally well on professional pursuits and on observations of America. Since the professional part of the experience was disappointing to them, however, they put more emphasis on observations of America, which in turn led to marked changes on the differentiation dimension. Thus, if this view is correct, the professional disappointment contributed to the effect; it did so, however, not so much by creating the motivation for compensatory satisfactions, as by giving relatively greater weight to one of the interests that was already on the High Differentiator's agenda. Subsequent tables may throw more light on this possibility.

Reactions to the Seminar in General

Table 12.3 presents the differences between the two groups in some of their reactions to the Seminar in general. In the first interview we find that High Differentiators are more likely to indicate that the invitations for the Seminar came too late, and this is not a good time for them to be in the United States. The most likely explanation of these findings is that High Differentiators--given their greater self-confidence and their greater freedom from linguistic and cultural barriers--feel more comfortable about expressing criticism. This factor may be relevant to our understanding of some of the other findings as well.

On the second interview we find--in accord with what we have already suggested in earlier sections--that the Low Differentiators have more positive feelings toward the sojourn so far than the Highs and are more likely to report that their feelings have become more positive since the time of their arrival. The High Differentiators are more likely to express mixed feelings than the Lows and to report that their feelings have become less positive. Problems mentioned by Low Differentiators at this point stem only from their shortcomings in language and background. The High Differentiators, by contrast, express dissatisfactions that are directly or indirectly related to their professional experience. They complain about the excessive length of the Seminar schedule and the unevenness in choice of Seminar participants. They are disappointed because of what they consider the low level at which professional discourse among participants is carried on, and because of the limited opportunity for personal participation on their part. They complain, for example, about the lack of facilities to present the samples of programs that they had brought along. The last difference, in particular, is quite large and is quite important. There is the suggestion that the High Differentiator found the professional experience at the university to be at a level below that which he had anticipated and was disappointed that he was not given the opportunity to make the specialized contributions that he came prepared to make.

Once the travel period began, the dissatisfaction of the High Differentiators seemed to dissipate. This may be due, in part, to the fact that their professional experiences in the field were indeed more satisfying than those at the university--although the one item from the third interview contained in Table 12.3 (as well as others, to be reported later) does not seem to support this idea. What is more likely, in the light of the data presented in the last section, is that the High Differentiators had shifted their focus so that their level of satisfaction was no longer highly dependent on the quality of their professional experience.

Results of the fourth interview are somewhat ambiguous. Consistently with earlier findings, High Differentiators are more likely

## Table 12.3

## REACTIONS TO THE SEMINAR IN GENERAL

Comparison of Participants who showed High and Low Increases in Differentiation in Before- and After-Questionnaires

| Items that Discriminate | Number of Participants Agreeing to Item: High Increase | Low Increase |
|---|---|---|
| **First Interview** | | |
| Invitations came too late | 8 | 2 |
| Not a good time to be coming to U.S. | 3 | 0 |
| **Second Interview** | | |
| Somewhat dissatisfied with American visit | | |
| --excessive length of schedule | 3 | 0 |
| --uneven choice of Fellows | 4 | 1 |
| Problems stemmed from own shortcomings in language and background | 0 | 4 |
| Positive feelings about the sojourn | 6 | 9 |
| Mixed or neutral feelings about the sojourn | 4 | 1 |
| Feelings since arrival | | |
| --have become more positive | 1 | 5 |
| --have become less positive | 4 | 1 |
| Disappointed because Seminar did not allow greater participation (e.g., did not provide facilities for Fellows to present own video tape material) | 7 | 1 |
| Disappointed by low level of professional discussion among Fellows | 4 | 0 |
| **Third Interview** | | |
| Interactions with broadcasters in the field were clearly more valuable than those with broadcasters at Brandeis | 0 | 3 |
| **Fourth Interview** | | |
| Seminar goals seemed inappropriate | 3 | 0 |
| Seminar afforded enough opportunity for exchange of ideas among participants | 4 | 7 |
| Future seminars should have more planned discussions among participants | 5 | 1 |
| Seminars were adequately matched to own background, interests | 8 | 5 |
| Seminar gave balanced picture on issues | 7 | 4 |
| Future selection should aim for: | | |
| --same kind of participants as present | 6 | 1 |
| --more specialization | 2 | 6 |
| **Post-Return Interview** | | |
| Enjoyed: | | |
| --chance to exchange ideas with other people | 5 | 1 |
| --seminars related to own special interests and experience | 3 | 0 |
| Time spent in lectures should be reduced | 1 | 5 |

to regard the goals of the Seminar as not entirely appropriate for this kind of group, and particularly to demand greater opportunities for exchange of ideas and discussions among the participants. On the other hand, the High Differentiators indicate that the Seminar was adequately suited to their particular background and interests. Moreover, and surprisingly, they are more likely to say that selection procedures for future seminars should aim for inclusion of the same kind of participants, while Low Differentiators would like to see the selection procedures consistent with a more specialized Seminar. It would seem that on these last items the High Differentiators were speaking in terms of their revised conception of the Seminar, in which the specific professional goals were played down. Thus, their criticisms of the level and composition of the Seminar during the university phase may seem less relevant to them when they now review the total experience. Interestingly, it is the Low Differentiators--who have become more, rather than less oriented to the professional possibilities of the experience--who now call for greater specialization as a criterion for the selection of participants.

The post-return interview provides little relevant information here. High Differentiators are more likely to mention, as enjoyable experiences during their American visit, the opportunities to exchange ideas with others (American broadcasters, other participants) when it was available, and those seminars that were related to their own special interests and background. Low Differentiators suggest that in future Seminars the time devoted to lectures and seminars should be reduced; this seems consistent with their increasing emphasis--after the Seminar got underway--on professionally relevant experiences (in contrast to academic seminars, in particular).

In sum, the data presented in this section seem consistent with the formulation that the High Differentiators were disappointed in and quite critical of the professional part of their experience at the university, that they apparently shifted their focus to other pursuits, and that (probably as a result) their level of satisfaction rose during the travel period and remained high. The Low Differentiators, on the other hand, were satisfied with the initial professional experience and as a result became more firmly oriented toward professional pursuits during their visit. Evidence supporting our view of the two groups' reactions to the initial period is presented in the next section.

## Reactions to the University Phase of the Seminar

Table 12.4 contains the long list of items discriminating between High and Low Differentiators in their reactions specifically to the period at the university. Here we find the discomfiture of the High Differentiators laid out in full. Indeed, in the entire list only one item suggests that the Highs found more pleasure than the Lows during that period; that is in the item showing that more Highs were satisfied with their own contribution to the Seminar. If the Highs were more satisfied with their own contribution, they clearly were less satisfied with the conditions at hand that limited that contribution from attaining its maximum, and that reduced the value of the professional experience in general, at least in their estimation.

## Table 12.4

## REACTIONS TO THE BRANDEIS PERIOD

Comparison of Participants who showed High and Low Increases in Differentiation in Before- and After-Questionnaires

| | Number of Participants Agreeing to Item | |
|---|---|---|
| Items that Discriminate | High Increase | Low Increase |
| Second Interview | | |
| Poor planning shown in: | | |
| --failure to provide facilities to allow Fellows to present own programs | 4 | 0 |
| --inefficiency with which administrative details were handled | 6 | 3 |
| --lack of mature administrative personnel | 3 | 0 |
| --excessive heterogeneity of Seminar group | 5 | 0 |
| Good planning shown in: | | |
| --provision of highly skilled broadcasting people as speakers | 2 | 5 |
| --excursions to mass media facilities | 0 | 4 |
| --weekend visit to American families in New Hampshire | 4 | 7 |
| Poor planning led to: | | |
| --inconvenience of inadequate personal transportation | 9 | 6 |
| --inadequate provision for leisure time activities | 5 | 1 |
| Believes participants didn't have enough chance to determine the course of the Seminar | 5 | 0 |
| Has negative evaluation of Fellow's Committee | 3 | 0 |
| Believes Fellow's Committee could have been used to transmit personal complaints | 6 | 2 |
| Was largely satisfied with own contribution to Seminar | 5 | 2 |
| Saw much value in contributions of other Fellows | 5 | 10 |
| Appreciates programs presented by Fellows from technically advanced countries | 3 | 6 |
| Feels that multi-national composition was clearly beneficial | 1 | 9 |
| Multi-national composition allowed adverse diversity of: | | |
| --professional background | 7 | 4 |
| --professional knowledge | 3 | 0 |
| --ideology | 4 | 0 |
| Seminar group seemed highly congenial | 1 | 8 |
| Seminar group's cohesion was limited by: | | |
| --diversity of interests | 3 | 0 |
| --conflict of ideologies | 3 | 0 |
| --personal idiosyncrasies | 6 | 0 |
| Professional sessions did not allow time for Fellow's own presentation | 3 | 0 |
| Too many speakers at professional sessions | 3 | 0 |

The High Differentiators were generally more critical of the planning and execution of different parts of the Seminar during this early phase. Thus, they were more likely to complain that administrative details had been handled inefficiently and that administrative personnel were not sufficiently mature. More specifically, they complained about the inconvenience caused by inadequate personal transportation and about the inadequate provision of leisure time activities. They were also less ready to express satisfaction with the quality of the speakers who were brought in, with the visits to various communication facilities, and with the weekend spent with American families in New Hampshire. They were even less willing to recognize the value of the committee of participants that had been set up.

Their main criticisms, however, focused very clearly on two issues. First, they would have liked to see more opportunity for active participation on the part of Seminar participants. Thus, the High Differentiators, as compared to the Lows, were more likely to feel that the professional seminars had too many scheduled speakers and provided insufficient time for presentations by the participants themselves; to complain about the failure of the Seminar organizers to provide adequate facilities for the presentation of participants' own programs; and to state that participants did not have enough chance to determine the course of the Seminar. Secondly, they expressed many reservations about the composition of the Seminar. Compared to the Low Differentiators, they felt that the group was too heterogeneous and did not see much value in the contributions of their fellow-participants. They did not regard the multi-national composition of the Seminar as clearly beneficial. They were more inclined to feel that it made for too much diversity in professional background, professional knowledge, and ideology, with possible adverse effects. Not surprisingly, they therefore did not share the view of the Low Differentiators that this was a highly congenial group. Personal idiosyncrasies, conflicts of ideology, and diversity of interests all limited group cohesivensss in their estimation. On the items relating to group composition we find some of the sharpest differences between High and Low Differentiators.

It would seem then that some of the High Differentiators were disappointed in the first phase of the Seminar largely because they were unable to play a role congruent with their capacities, and because they felt that the lesser competence and experience of some of their fellow-participants forced the Seminar into a professionally less challenging and productive mold. Their expectations for an experience in which the professional knowledge that they had to offer would be eagerly sought and in which, at the same time, they would be able to raise even further their own level of competence and be involved in enriching exchanges were clearly not met. It is reasonable to suppose that, in the face of this disappointment, they would turn their attention into other directions.

The Low Differentiator, on the other hand, saw the experience at the university very differently. He appreciated the good planning that had been done and that enabled him to hear highly skilled broadcasting people as speakers, to make excursions to broadcast stations and newspaper plants on the Eastern seaboard, and to make the weekend visit to a New Hampshire family. He regarded the multi-national group composition as clearly beneficial. He saw a good deal of value in the contributions of other participants, and especially appreciated the programs that were given by those participants coming from technically advanced countries. He found the group a congenial one. Finally, he really seemed to have almost no interest in making the kinds of contributions that the Highs had unsuccessfully attempted. Not a single one of the Low Differentiators complained about the lack of time or facilities for presentations by the participants, or about insufficient opportunity to determine the course of the Seminar. The Low Differentiators, it would seem, had not come with an expectation to contribute actively, and they were satisfied with the course the Seminar was taking.

There remains one other possibility that we have already suggested earlier. It may be that the High Differentiators--because of their greater self-confidence and their greater freedom from linguistic and cultural barriers--feel more comfortable about expressing criticism than the Low Differentiators. While this may well be true, it would not explain the total pattern of findings presented in Table 12.4, particularly the consistent differences with regard to personal participation and group composition.

Before leaving the discussion of the university phase of the Seminar, let us look briefly at Table 12.6 which presents the differences between the two groups on several items bearing on their reactions to the social aspects of the experience. In keeping with their greater cultural proximity to the host society, the High Differentiators tended to spend more time at theatres and concerts; to find visits to cultural sights more rewarding; and to be more eager for current newspapers--and hence to complain when they are lacking. They are also more likely to complain about insufficient time for spontaneous socializing, which is in a sense continuous with their criticism of the professional program as being too heavily scheduled, thus allowing insufficient time for participants' contribution. The Low Differentiators, as we have already seen, are particularly pleased with the opportunity they had to spend a weekend with a New Hampshire family. This is consistent with their less specific interest in becoming better acquainted with the "average American" (see Table 12.1).

## Reactions to the Travel Phase of the Seminar

It is clear from Table 12.5 that the sharp difference between High and Low Differentiators that appeared in the second interview has now disappeared. It is true that the Low Differentiators tend to be more satisfied with their general itinerary and to find their transportation arrangements and per diem allowance more adequate. On the other hand, however, it is the Low Differentiators who are more likely to complain about the adequacy of hotel accommodations.

On the professional side, however, the High Differentiators still show less satisfaction. When asked about places visited that they found particularly unrewarding, they are more likely than Low Differentiators to cite places lacking professional relevance for them. In the parallel question about places that they found particularly rewarding, High Differentiators are more likely to

## Table 12.5

## REACTIONS TO THE TRAVEL PERIOD

Comparison of Participants who showed High and Low Increases in Differentiation in Before- and After-Questionnaires

| Items that Discriminate | Number of Participants Agreeing to Item | |
|---|---|---|
| | High Increase | Low Increase |
| **Third Interview** | | |
| Facilities: | | |
| --transportation was inadequate | 4 | 1 |
| --*per diem* allowance was inadequate | 5 | 2 |
| --hotel arrangements were adequate | 5 | 2 |
| --hotels were poorly located | 0 | 3 |
| --hotels lacked personal comforts | 1 | 4 |
| Itinerary was satisfactory | 3 | 6 |
| Some places visited were not professionally appropriate, because activities had been curtailed for the summer | 4 | 0 |
| Some places visited were not professionally relevant | 3 | 0 |
| Some places visited were valuable because scenic | 3 | 0 |
| The opportunity to observe a station was satisfactory | 7 | 10 |
| Could meet Americans spontaneously | 4 | 8 |
| Didn't have enough chance to observe all he wanted to | 0 | 4 |
| Visited the American South | 7 | 4 |
| Still wants to visit: | | |
| --the South | 2 | 5 |
| --the East | 3 | 8 |

## Table 12.6

## REACTIONS TO THE SOCIAL ASPECTS OF THE SOJOURN

| Items that Discriminate | High Increase | Low Increase |
|---|---|---|
| **Second Interview** | | |
| Spent time at theatre, concerts | 7 | 4 |
| Enjoyed visits to cultural sights | 3 | 0 |
| Resented lack of current newspaper | 4 | 1 |
| Not enough time for spontaneous socializing | 6 | 2 |
| Found New Hampshire weekend especially valuable | 6 | 9 |

cite places excelling in their scenic beauty. This is consistent with our earlier suggestion that the Highs--in line with their apparent change in focus--were more willing to admit to tourist pleasures. High Differentiators were also more likely to mention that some of the places they visited were unsatisfactory from a professional point of view because activities of interest to them had been curtailed for the summer. Here it must be kept in mind that the High group included a larger proportion of educational broadcasters, who were at a disadvantage because many of the schools they wanted to visit were closed for vacation. Finally, High Differentiators were less likely to indicate that they had satisfactory opportunities to observe broadcasting stations. In short, the indications are that High Differentiators are not quite as satisfied with their professional experience as the Low Differentiators even during the travel period, but this does not seem to affect their general level of satisfaction.

## Perceptions and Evaluations of America and Americans

Discriminating items that deal with the perception of Americans and of America are presented in Table 12.7. From the first interview we learn that the High Differentiators came to their experience with a history of greater contact with America and Americans. This is consistent with our formulation that they came more ready to engage in searching interactions and with a better articulated cognitive framework about the United States to which new information can be assimilated.

There are quite a few findings indicating that the High Differentiators were indeed engaging in the process of differentiation to a greater extent than the Low Differentiators. Even in the first interview, our coders were more likely to rate the first impressions of the Low Differentiators as superficial. In the third interview, held during the travel period, High Differentiators were more likely than Lows to have noted political differences between the regions they had visited, while Low Differentiators were more likely than Highs to have noted differences in weather. Highs were also more likely to mention spontaneously the importance of racial and ethnic differences in the United States. (3) High Differentiators were more likely to mention their understanding of the importance of diversity and variety in America among the new insights into American life that they had gained during their travels. Low Differentiators' answers to the latter question were rated by the coders as covering a narrower range. On the post-return interview, High Differentiators were more likely to mention that they were favorably impressed by the size, complexity, and variety of America; and to feel that America's complexity and diversity make it impossible to speak of a single American point of view. They are also more likely to cite racial and ethnic groups as differing in their points of view. All of these items essentially serve to validate the criterion by which the two groups were initially distinguished.

---

(3) The item in Table 12.7 showing that Lows are more likely to feel that socio-economic differences play an important role is based on a specific question about the role of socio-economic differences, rather than a spontaneous mention of this phenomenon.

## Table 12.7

## PERCEPTIONS AND EVALUATIONS OF AMERICA AND AMERICANS

### Comparison of Participants who showed High and Low Increases in Differentiation in Before- and After-Questionnaires

| Items that Discriminate | Number of Participants Agreeing to Item: High Increase | Number of Participants Agreeing to Item: Low Increase |
|---|---|---|
| **First Interview** | | |
| Has had close friendships with Americans before | 8 | 5 |
| Has kept contact with American friends | 6 | 3 |
| Has had professional associates who have lived in America | 6 | 3 |
| Salient first impressions of U.S. were entirely positive | 7 | 10 |
| One focus of first impressions was the high cost of living | 5 | 1 |
| Participant's first impressions of U.S. seem superficial to raters | 0 | 3 |
| **Second Interview** | | |
| Wants to learn more about American educational system | 2 | 5 |
| **Third Interview** | | |
| Recognizes regional differences: | | |
| --in weather | 1 | 4 |
| --in politics | 3 | 0 |
| --in the ease with which one can meet people | 4 | 1 |
| Sees important racial and ethnic differences | 6 | 2 |
| Feels that socio-economic differences play an important role | 4 | 8 |
| Feels that American broadcasting has been influenced by: | | |
| --racial and ethnic differences | 2 | 5 |
| --socio-economic differences | 1 | 5 |
| Has focused some of his observations of America on: | | |
| --the state of broadcasting | 5 | 2 |
| --American political system | 3 | 0 |
| --religious aspects of American life | 7 | 4 |
| His most important new insights into American life: | | |
| --involved qualities of the American people | 5 | 2 |
| --included attending to the country's diversity and variety | 5 | 1 |
| --involved the country's institutional structure | 2 | 6 |
| --covered a narrow range | 3 | 6 |

Table 12.7 (cont'd.)

PERCEPTIONS AND EVALUATIONS OF AMERICA AND AMERICANS

| Items that Discriminate | Number of Participants Agreeing to Item | |
|---|---|---|
| | High Increase | Low Increase |
| **Third Interview** (cont'd.) | | |
| His major disappointments with America: | | |
| --fall in non-professional areas | 6 | 10 |
| --include the handling of the Negro problem | 2 | 5 |
| Is pleased by America's democratic atmosphere | 1 | 6 |
| **Fourth Interview** | | |
| Not sorry to be leaving America | 3 | 7 |
| Will make heavily favorable reports about America upon return home | 7 | 4 |
| Has become more aware of actual heightof the American standard of living | 1 | 4 |
| **Post-Return Interview** | | |
| Has given programs about America that: | | |
| --were instructional in nature | 4 | 0 |
| --dealt with places or personalities of special interest | 6 | 3 |
| --included specific materials that gave little insight as to his image of America | 5 | 0 |
| --were documentaries | 6 | 9 |
| --were newscasts | 1 | 4 |
| --dealt with American communications media | 0 | 3 |
| --dealt with American social and economic institutions | 0 | 3 |
| --included materials that would tend to broaden the perspective about America | 4 | 7 |
| Was favorably impressed by: | | |
| --America's size, complexity, variety | 4 | 0 |
| --America's beauty | 4 | 0 |
| --Generosity and hospitality of Americans | 3 | 7 |
| --Friendliness and informality of Americans | 4 | 0 |
| Emphasized, upon return home, America's wealth, living standard, advanced technology | 1 | 5 |
| Was upset by the extent and severity of the American racial problem | 1 | 4 |
| Feels that America's complexity and diversity forbid one's conceiving such a thing as a single American point of view | 6 | 2 |
| Preoccupation with Communism is a salient part of American viewpoint | 0 | 3 |
| Expects racial and ethnic groups in U.S. to have distinct viewpoints | 6 | 2 |

There are no stable and consistent differences between the groups in the positiveness of their feelings toward America, but they differ in some of the features they stress for positive and negative comment. Thus, the Low Differentiators are more likely to express pleasure at America's democratic atmosphere and disappointment in the handling of the racial problem. The High Differentiators are more likely to comment favorably on the beauty of America and--as we have already mentioned--its size, complexity, and variety; and to mention disappointments in the professional area. As for Americans, High Differentiators are more favorably impressed than Lows with their friendliness and informality; Lows are more favorably impressed than Highs with their generosity and hospitality. Thus the Highs seem to be focusing on qualities of Americans that facilitate give-and-take interaction, while the Lows (in line with our earlier observation about their favorable reaction to the weekend visit with an American family) focus on qualities of Americans that imply acceptance of them as visitors.

Finally, there are also some differences in the features of America to which the two groups seem to be responding. High Differentiators are more likely to report new insights into the qualities of the American people, Low Differentiators into the country's institutional structure. Highs are more likely to have focused observations on the American political system and the role of religion, Lows on socio-economic differences, and the generally high standard of living and advanced technology. Low Differentiators are also more likely to have noted preoccupation with Communism as a salient part of the American point of view.

## Perceptions and Evaluations of American Broadcasting

In the second interview, as can be seen from Table 12.8, High Differentiators are less likely to state that they have learned a great deal about American mass media than are Lows, and in fact they tend to describe American media with less detail. This is somewhat surprising, but may reflect their general disappointment in the professional part of their experience at the university, as compared to the increasing enthusiasm of the Low Differentiators.

Data from both the third and the post-return interviews show that the High Differentiator group (which, as we know, includes a larger proportion of educational broadcasters) is more impressed with the way in which TV is used for instructional purposes in the United States. In general, however, it is the Low Differentiators who are more favorably impressed with American broadcasting, although they feel that their own broadcasting systems should avoid American Westerns and can teach America something about constructive uses of radio.

The relatively more critical attitudes of the High Differentiators show up most sharply and consistently in their reactions to the commercial involvement of American broadcasting. Thus, in the third interview, the Highs feel that the pressure of advertisers constrains American broadcasters, that the fear of government control hinders solutions, that private ownership of broadcasting has little positive to offer, and that Americans who are aware of the

### Table 12.8

### PERCEPTIONS AND EVALUATIONS OF AMERICAN BROADCASTING

Comparison of Participants who showed High and Low Increases in Differentiation in Before- and After-Questionnaires

| Items that Discriminate | Number of Participants Agreeing to Item: High Increase | Number of Participants Agreeing to Item: Low Increase |
|---|---|---|
| **Second Interview** | | |
| Has learned: | | |
| --a great deal about U.S. mass communication | 3 | 7 |
| --a good deal about U.S. mass communication | 4 | 1 |
| Describes American mass media: | | |
| --superficially | 6 | 3 |
| --in good detail | 3 | 7 |
| **Third Interview** | | |
| Feels homeland should: | | |
| --adopt closed circuit TV in educational broadcasting | 3 | 0 |
| --avoid Westerns | 0 | 3 |
| Feels America should imitate homeland's high level of public service and educational radio programming | 0 | 4 |
| Feels American broadcasters are overly constrained by the pressure of advertisers | 6 | 3 |
| Feels that fear of government control is a major problem for American broadcasting | 3 | 0 |
| Feels that private ownership of broadcasting: | | |
| --has advantages for America | 2 | 8 |
| --is especially suited to American conditions | 1 | 5 |
| --makesfor competition between stations | 1 | 4 |
| --forces neglect of specialized audiences | 2 | 5 |
| Feels that Americans, aware of the problems caused by private ownership: | | |
| --are doing little to solve them | 7 | 4 |
| --are making real efforts at solution | 1 | 4 |
| **Post-Return Interview** | | |
| Evaluation of American broadcasters: | | |
| --generally favorable | 4 | 7 |
| --mixed | 5 | 1 |
| Believes that American broadcasting may suffer from too much commercial interference | 3 | 0 |
| Reports upon return home noted: | | |
| --the importance of avoiding American-style commercialism | 3 | 0 |
| --the effective use of TV in America for instructional purposes | 9 | 4 |

problems caused by private ownership are doing little to solve them. In the post-return interview, again, some of the High Differentiators bring up the disadvantages of commercial control and interference. The Low Differentiators, by contrast, are not so convinced of the problems caused by private ownership. They can see advantages to America resulting from private ownership--they suggest that it may be suited to the particular circumstances of American society and that it makes for healthy competition. On the other hand, they feel it does force the neglect of specialized audiences. They are more prone to feel that those Americans who see the problems caused by private ownership are acting to ameliorate them. The High Differentiators' greater willingness to criticize is perhaps a reflection of their greater self-confidence, particularly in the professional sphere.

## Views on International Exchange

Differential reactions noted in Table 12.9 are not surprising. The High Differentiators continue to present themselves as persons of high technical competence who are engaged in high-level activity in a professional career. Thus, it is they who more often report that they have professional knowledge to contribute to international exchange, and it is they who--at the end of their stay in America--more often expect considerable future professional contact with Americans. In the post-return interview, they are more likely to report contacts with visiting broadcasters and plans to take part in international exchanges in the future. In addition, they believe that their country has a contribution to make, teaching from its particular experiences in the field of educational broadcasting. Finally, it is the Highs who are able at the post-return interview to spell out in great detail the possible benefits from exchange programs--keeping up to date about new developments in the field, exchanging program materials, introducing new ideas, and increasing technical knowledge.

The Highs thus seem to have a greater professional involvement in and more elaborated conception of international exchange. It is interesting that it is the Lows, however, who more often express favorable attitudes toward international exchange. Their conception of the benefits of exchange is rather more global and undifferentiated; exchange can aid in the interchange of professional knowledge and in the building of international understanding. But it is among the Lows that we find more people, both in the fourth interview and in the post-return interview, who tell us they have become more positive about international exchange, that their experiences have made them approve of exchange more than they did before.

## Perceptions and Evaluations of Own Country and of its Broadcasting System

The items found in Table 12.10, showing differential reactions to own country and its broadcasting system, are consistent with our sense of the two groups, if not remarkably enlightening. The Highs continue to be interested in educational broadcasting and to want to see it expanded. There are more Lows than Highs who have become aware, while in America, that education must be advanced rapidly at

## Table 12.9

## VIEWS ON INTERNATIONAL EXCHANGE

Comparison of Participants who showed High and Low Increases in Differentiation in Before- and After-Questionnaires

| Items that Discriminate | Number of Participants Agreeing to Item | |
|---|---|---|
| | High Increase | Low Increase |
| **Fourth Interview** | | |
| Views have become more positive | 1 | 4 |
| Exchange promotes: | | |
| --beneficial interchange of professional knowledge | 1 | 4 |
| --understanding between people | 1 | 5 |
| Own potential contribution: professional knowledge | 6 | 1 |
| Anticipates considerable future professional contact with Americans | 5 | 0 |
| **Post-Return Interview** | | |
| American experience has increased his approval of international exchange | 5 | 8 |
| Other nations can contribute to his homeland's development by exchange of personnel | 5 | 2 |
| His homeland can contribute by sharing its unique experience of educational broadcasting | 4 | 0 |
| International exchange can be of value: | | |
| --in the exchange of program material | 9 | 3 |
| --in the exchange of information about developments in communications media | 8 | 3 |
| --by introducing participants to new ideas applicable at home | 4 | 1 |
| --by increasing technical knowledge of participants | 6 | 1 |
| Has present contact with visiting broadcasters | 6 | 2 |
| Plans to participate in international exchange | 8 | 5 |

## Table 12.10

## PERCEPTIONS AND EVALUATIONS OF OWN COUNTRY AND ITS BROADCASTING SYSTEM

| Items that Discriminate | Number of Participants Agreeing to Item | |
|---|---|---|
| | High Increase | Low Increase |
| **Third Interview** | | |
| Now sees need for more rapid advancement in education at home | 0 | 3 |
| **Post-Return Interview** | | |
| Now appreciates slow pace of home country more | 4 | 0 |
| Feels that home systems are expanding educational broadcasting | 7 | 4 |
| Approves of extension of educational broadcasting | 7 | 2 |

home; there are more Highs than Lows who have become aware, while in America, that the slower pace of life at home has its advantages.

## High vs. Low Differentiation: A Summary

Two characteristics of the High Differentiators stand out from the total array of data that has been presented: (1) They come to the American experience with considerable self-confidence about their professional competence and their ability to make the contacts and gain the information they want--a self-confidence bolstered by their linguistic and cultural proximity to the host society. In line with this self-orientation, they have great expectations for a satisfactory and useful experience. (2) They are greatly disappointed in the professional part of this experience, particularly during the first phase of the sojourn, spent at the university. Their satisfaction seems to rise again, however, as they tend to turn away from an emphasis on professional pursuits to an emphasis on other aspects of the experience, including the opportunity to learn about American society.

These and other findings suggest the following factors, in interaction with each other, as possible determinants of the increased differentiation manifested by this group of participants:

(1) The absence of cultural and linguistic barriers, the self-confidence about their professional roles, and the specificity of their expectations make it possible for them to connect quickly and easily with the Americans they meet and to enter into searching, give-and-take interactions with them. It is through such encounters that a visitor can be exposed to the variety and complexity of Americans and their views and thus develop a more differentiated image.

(2) They also bring to the experience a better articulated cognitive framework about the United States which helps them scan and assimilate new information more quickly and to integrate more readily the insights they achieve through observation and discussion. Thus, they are more tooled up for developing a detailed and elaborated image.

(3) Their disappointment in the professional experience--which is, in part, a function of their self-confidence and their initially great expectations--leads them to revise their goals and turn to other pursuits. Among other things, they focus on American society and American life, and take an interest in learning about these in depth. This interest was probably present from the beginning, but they give greater weight to it in view of their professional disappointment. When coupled with their readiness to engage in searching interactions and to integrate new information about America into a fairly well articulated cognitive framework, this interest helps to account for the increased differentiation manifested by this group.

It is possible, of course, that this group would have shown a similar increase in differentiation even in the absence of professional disappointment. The fact that professional disappointment and high differentiation tend to go together in the present study certainly does not establish a causal connection between them. One thing that can be said with some assurance, however, is that professional disappointment does not necessarily preclude meaningful changes, on other dimensions, provided the total experience allows for other kinds of satisfactions--as the present Seminar certainly did, particularly in the way in which the travel period was arranged.

We have been speaking entirely of the High Differentiators so far. About the Low Differentiators one can say, of course, that they lacked the special dispositions and experiences that were conducive to increased differentiation in the other group. There are some hints, however, that this may be an interesting group in its own right, which is marked not merely by the absence of change in differentiation, but by the presence of certain other characteristics. Thus, for example, it seems that the Low Differentiators become more involved professionally as the Seminar progresses; that they view, not only the professional experience, but also American broadcasting and international exchanges in a favorable light; and that they are especially interested in and appreciative of personal contacts with Americans of all kinds. It is quite likely that the Low Differentiator group does reflect another syndrome which, however, because of the negative way in which this group was defined (i.e., by the absence of differentiation change) cannot emerge clearly from the present data. Perhaps another way of forming groups for comparison may pick up this syndrome more adequately. One possibility that readily suggests itself in this connection is a comparison between Europeans and non-Europeans. We have already seen that there is some correlation, though not a strong one, between High vs. Low Differentiation and European vs. non-European. Moreover, some of the differences that we have noted between High and Low Differentiators are quite reminiscent of differences one might expect to find between Europeans and non-Europeans participating in the present type of Seminar. To explore this possiblity, we have divided our sample into Europeans and non-Europeans and shall proceed, in the next chapter, to present comparisons between these two groups--comparisons that partially overlap those that have concerned us in the present chapter.

# CHAPTER 13

# COMPARISON OF EUROPEANS AND NON-EUROPEANS

In Chapter 12 we compared two subgroups of participants that had been selected on the basis of an outcome variable: one group--the High Differentiators--consisted of individuals about whom we knew that their image of America and American broadcasting had become more complex and differentiated in the course of the year that included their American sojourn; the other group--the Low Differentiators--consisted of individuals who had not shown this change. Our task then was to explore the factors distinguishing these two groups--the personal characteristics, experiences, and reactions to these experiences that seem to be related to increased differentiation.

In the present chapter, we are again comparing two subgroups of participants, selected, however, on an entirely different basis--namely, on the basis of a difference in certain defining characteristics of the visitors. Any visitor brings with him certain personal characteristics that help to shape the nature of his experience in the host country. These will include his store of knowledge, his goals, his personal agenda for the visit, his pre-existing conceptions of the host, and his capacity to speak casually and intimately with members of the host nation. These characteristics guide his perceptions, determine his modes of coping with his experiences, and evoke particular responses from those who meet him. They play an important role, therefore--in interaction with the situation in which the visitor actually finds himself and with the experiences that he actually undergoes--in determining his reactions to the sojourn and the impact it has upon him. Each visitor, of course, has a unique set of such personal characteristics. There are certain characteristics, however, shared within various subgroups of visitors, that may affect their ways of relating themselves to the experience with some degree of consistency, allowing the analyst to identify distinct patterns of reaction for these groups. On the basis of earlier research and perusal of our own data, we suspected that European vs. non-European origin of the Seminar participants might be such a distinguishing characteristic. The present chapter is devoted, therefore, to a comparison between the European and non-European members of the Seminar.

We are using the term "European" here as the best approximation of the distinguishing characteristic that we have in mind. We have classified as "European," for our purposes, not only those participants who reside on the European continent, but all those whose cultural origin is essentially European and who (regardless of where they live) are most closely identified with the industrialized sector of the world. Thus, we include as European in our classification not only the British, Italian, Swedish, and Yugoslav participants, but also those from Australia, Cyprus, and Israel and the Englishmen working in Africa. Participants from Jamaica, Iran, the Philippines, and Thailand, as well as the seven African participants, we classified as non-Europeans. The Japanese participants were difficult to classify in terms of the scheme we had in mind since, on the one hand, they come from a culture that is non-European in origin, yet in terms of level of industrial development is clearly closer to Europe than it is to Africa and Asia. We decided, therefore, to omit the Japanese participants from the present comparison. We are left with 26 cases, of whom thirteen are classified as Europeans and thirteen as non-Europeans.

Let us review the salient differences by which these two groups are defined. The Europeans come from cultures that are more similar to American culture than those from which the non-Europeans come. (This does not mean that all of the Europeans, as individuals, are necessarily more familiar with American culture than the non-Europeans.) The Europeans are white-skinned, the non-Europeans are non-white. The Europeans are identified with the industrialized part of the world (even if they may live in a relatively underdeveloped area), the non-Europeans with the developing part of the world. The Europeans are generally associated with experienced and sophisticated broadcasting systems or received their basic training within such systems, the non-Europeans less so.

So much for the defining characteristics of the two groups. In terms of areas of professional specialization, they distribute as follows:

| | Europeans | Non-Europeans |
|---|---|---|
| Educational | 4 | 4 |
| News and current events | 5 | 2 |
| General programming | 4 | 7 |

Thus, a somewhat larger proportion of the Europeans is concerned with news broadcasting and documentaries; a somewhat larger proportion of non-Europeans is in general programming. In the light of findings we reported in earlier chapters, there ought to be a somewhat greater tendency for the Europeans to be interested in general American affairs, since political or cultural insights far removed from the Seminar would still be grist for the professional mill of the newscaster.

What is the relationship between the European vs. non-European split and change in differentiation? If we cross-tabulate the participants who show up in both breakdowns we obtain the following distribution:

| | Europeans | Non-Europeans |
|---|---|---|
| High Differentiators | 6 | 3 |
| Low Differentiators | 4 | 5 |

There is, thus, some tendency for the Europeans to be among the High Differentiators, and the non-Europeans among the Low Differentiators. The overlap between these two classifications is far from perfect, however. (It should be recalled, for example, that the Low Differentiator group included four non-English-speaking Europeans.) Further evidence for the relationship between the two variables can be obtained from a comparison of the scores on the index of change in differentiation obtained by the Europeans and non-Europeans. For this comparison we used the twelve Europeans and nine non-Europeans for whom stable scores on the index were available.(1)

---

(1) That is, we included those individuals who had not been

The mean score for Europeans is 2.25, the mean for non-Europeans 0.89. The same relationship holds when we partition the index into one measuring change in differentiation in the image of America and Americans, and one dealing with the image of American broadcasting. On the former, the mean score for Europeans is 2.17, for non-Europeans 1.16. On the latter, the respective scores are 0.95 and 0.32.

Thus, Europeans do tend to show more increase in differentiation than non-Europeans do. We can, therefore, expect to find some parallels between the two sets of comparisons. That is, we can expect the reactions of Europeans to resemble, to some extent, the reactions of the High Differentiators, as described in Chapter 12; and the reactions of non-Europeans to resemble those of Low Differentiators. The overlap between these two classificatory schemes, however, as we have already noted, is far from perfect; so it may well be that--despite the positive relationship between the two variables (origin and differentiation change)--the key differences between Europeans and non-Europeans will turn out to be along other dimensions than the key differences between High and Low Differentiators.

Let us turn, therefore, to a comparison between Europeans and non-Europeans on several clusters of items covering different substantive domains. As in Chapter 12, we are including in the tables that follow all those items on which the frequencies of response between the two groups differ by three or more cases. It must be noted, however, that for the present comparisons a difference of 3 represents only a 23% difference (since the size of each group is 13), and the caution about drawing conclusions from single items, voiced in Chapter 12, is therefore even more apropos. We shall, in fact, address most of our attention to differences of 4 or above.

## Expectations and Goals

Table 13.1 presents the differences between the two groups in their expectations and goals.

The European took special pains to prepare samples of his own work before arrival, whereas the non-European was more likely to have prepared information about his home country. The European was more likely to be clear as to what his own role in the Seminar was to be, but was more likely to feel that the purposes of the Seminar had not been made clear. The European was more likely to feel sure about his own unique contribution to the Seminar. Taken together, these items suggest that the European was more likely to believe that he had been invited in order to share the knowledge and expertise that he had achieved in his professional work.

---

(1) - cont'd: assigned to the High or Low Differentiator group because they had scores at the median, but excluded those who were unassigned because they had answered too few of the questions on which the change index was based.

## Table 13.1

## EXPECTATIONS AND GOALS

| Items that Discriminate | Europeans | Non-Europeans |
|---|---|---|
| **First Interview** | | |
| Prior to arrival: | | |
| --felt that information about the purposes of the Seminar was inadequate | 6 | 3 |
| --was unclear what own role in Seminar was to be | 2 | 5 |
| --prepared additional information regarding homeland | 2 | 5 |
| --read some of the books that had been sent | 9 | 4 |
| --took special pains to prepare samples of own work | 4 | 1 |
| Expects academic sessions to be: | | |
| --useless and irrelevant | 3 | 0 |
| --useful but professionally irrelevant | 8 | 5 |
| --useful and professionally relevant | 2 | 8 |
| Does not plan to participate actively in academic seminars | 4 | 1 |
| Expects difficulty in the academic seminars | 8 | 4 |
| Expects difficulty in the academic seminars because of poor knowledge of English | 3 | 0 |
| Feels that he had a unique contribution to the Seminar, and was sure what it would be | 9 | 6 |
| His plans for the travel period include: | | |
| --general sightseeing | 11 | 5 |
| --becoming better acquainted with American broadcasting facilities | 12 | 9 |
| --obtaining first-hand data on the functioning of the American government | 3 | 0 |
| Knows which specific places wished to visit during travel | 4 | 7 |
| Has previously wanted to visit U.S. | | |
| --to add to educational background | 0 | 4 |
| --to satisfy general curiosity | 0 | 4 |
| Anticipates problems in U.S. | 7 | 10 |
| Anticipated problems in U.S. included: | | |
| --language difficulties | 3 | 0 |
| --financial difficulties | 3 | 6 |
| **Second Interview** | | |
| Is dissatisfied with state of the arrangements for his forthcoming trip | 4 | 1 |
| Afraid that two months of travel will not be long enough | 4 | 1 |
| Anticipates trouble during travel: | | |
| --because of language difficulties | 3 | 0 |
| --because of racial discrimination | 0 | 3 |

Table 13.1 (cont'd)

| Expectations and Goals<br>Items that Discriminate | Europeans | Non-Europeans |
|---|---|---|
| **Second Interview** (cont'd) | | |
| Anticipated pleasures of the travel period include: | | |
| --non-professional activities, in general | 3 | 0 |
| --viewing the American landscape, in particular | 10 | 6 |
| **Fourth Interview** | | |
| Feels that a change in his position during the near future would be unlikely and undesirable | 5 | 2 |
| Would like to introduce innovations in programming | 3 | 6 |
| Anticipates a high degree of further professional contact with other participants | 2 | 5 |
| **Post-Return Interview** | | |
| Plans for the future are unchanged | 5 | 0 |

The Europeans were considerably more inclined to predict that the academic seminars would be irrelevant from a professional point of view. They were more likely to expect difficulties in these seminars. In some cases these difficulties were related to their lack of English facility--a problem that several of the Europeans emphasized, as we already know. The non-Europeans did not share this fear of language difficulty, but were generally more apprehensive about the trip and especially fearful of financial difficulties. Nevertheless, they had previously wanted to visit America, partly to further their own education. Finally, we should note that the European has several rather specific intentions for the travel period, and that he is considerably more likely than the non-European to express an interest in other kinds of observations--including observations of the functioning of the American government and of broadcasting facilities.

In the second interview, the Europeans continue to be bothered by language difficulties; the non-Europeans express their fear of racial discrimination. The Europeans, once again, are willing to acknowledge an interest in touristic activities as part of their travel agenda.

Finally, the last two interviews portray the non-European as somewhat more affected by the sojourn than the European: he is more likely to feel that job changes will occur and be desirable, to expect further professional contact with the other participants, to expect that he will introduce innovations in programming, and to have changed his plans for the future.

This pattern of findings seems to add up to three main distinctions between the groups:

(1) From the beginning, Europeans tend to express an interest in non-professional activities--including general sightseeing and observations of American society. They do express an interest in becoming acquainted with broadcasting facilities--but, again, this is an interest in making observations, albeit of a professionally relevant kind. In contrast, the non-Europeans seem to be more task-oriented and more likely to focus on specific professional concerns. The one apparent inconsistency is the reaction of the two groups to the academic seminars. One might expect the Europeans to express a greater interest in them, in line with their interest in general observations of American society, yet they seem to be more negative. What they say, however, is that the academic seminars will be professionally irrelevant. This does not necessarily imply a criticism; it may simply mean that they are willing to accept, as part of their experience, an activity that has no professional relevance. The non-Europeans, however, are more likely to endow it with a professional justification.

(2) Consistent with their orientation, the Europeans (in contrast to the non-Europeans) do not expect the experience to have much of an impact on their professional activities and careers.

(3) On the whole, the Europeans seem to be surer of themselves and less anxious about their sojourn, except for the subgroup of Europeans who express concern about their language problem.

## Perceived Accomplishments and Satisfactions

Table 13.2 presents a long list of the discriminating items that relate to perceived accomplishments and satisfactions.

At the time of the second interview, we find that the European is much more likely to voice concern about the unevenness in choice of participants. He now expresses real appreciation of the academic seminars, as well as of the tours of broadcasting stations and related facilities. In the third interview, there are several indications that Europeans are considerably less oriented toward the professional side of their trip than are the non-Europeans. The Europeans enjoy the physical environment and learning about America, while the non-Europeans tend to stress specific professional accomplishments--such as acquisition of new professional skills and learning new approaches to broadcasting.

One has the impression that the Europeans have dismissed the professional value at least of the university phase of the Seminar--in large part because of the heterogeneous composition of the group--but they are not too unhappy about this turn of events. They came, from the very beginning, with strong non-professional interests, which they pursue both at the university and during their travel. They do not ignore professional concerns entirely, but seem to be quite content with the opportunity to observe what is happening in American broadcasting (in contrast to the non-Europeans, who are concerned with specific skills and procedures applicable to their own situations).

The fourth interview shows the same sort of development: the European is more often attentive to America, while the non-European is more often attentive to professional problems. The European locates his most enjoyable experiences in non-professional areas. He mentions the pleasure that he took in his personal contacts with Americans, in his observations of the man-made and natural environment, and in the travel period in general. His important achievements, like his enjoyable experiences, are located in non-professional areas. He speaks of having attained a greater understanding of the American way of life, of having acquired a first-hand knowledge of the United States, and of having gained a new perspective on America, its institutions, and people. Professional interestsdo come up in his interviews, but they are of a rather different kind than those discussed by the non-European. The European speaks mostly of the opportunity to observe broadcasting activities and facilities, and of forming new relations with fellow-professionals. He also mentions that his sojourn has produced a change in his perspective about the role of broadcasting in his home country. These professional concerns are of a very general kind: he observes, he compares, he meets colleagues. They are, in a sense, a professional tourism.

The non-European, by contrast, locates his enjoyable experiences and important accomplishments squarely in the professional areas. He values more specific professional experiences, such as exposure to new program ideas. He speaks of attaining a new perspective on his professional role. Thus, he seems to be engaged in a more intensive professional experience, in which he seeks out

Table 13.2

## PERCEIVED ACCOMPLISHMENTS AND SATISFACTIONS

| Items that Discriminate | Europeans | Non-Europeans |
|---|---|---|
| **Second Interview** | | |
| Satisfied with sojourn thus far | 12 | 8 |
| Dissatisfied with sojourn because of unevenness in the choice of participants | 6 | 1 |
| Most valuable or enjoyable experiences included: | | |
| --visit to American family in New Hampshire | 8 | 11 |
| --exposure to the academic seminars | 7 | 3 |
| --tours of communications facilities | 9 | 5 |
| **Third Interview** | | |
| Most enjoyable experience: aspects of the physical environment | 12 | 8 |
| Most important single accomplishment: | | |
| --was in professional area | 8 | 11 |
| --was in non-professional area | 5 | 2 |
| Important accomplishments included: | | |
| --learning about America | 8 | 5 |
| --acquiring new professional skills or knowledge by working at a station | 2 | 5 |
| --making new friends | 0 | 3 |
| --learning new approaches to broadcasting | 1 | 5 |
| Professional problems have arisen at home that make him wish he were there | 0 | 6 |
| **Fourth Interview** | | |
| Most meaningful or enjoyable experiences: | | |
| --were in the professional area | 4 | 7 |
| --were in a non-professional area | 9 | 4 |
| --included exposure to new program ideas | 3 | 8 |
| --included contact with fellow-participants | 2 | 5 |
| --included observation of local broadcasting activities and facilities | 10 | 4 |
| --included the travel period as a whole | 9 | 6 |
| --included interpersonal experiences with Americans | 9 | 6 |
| --included observations of the physical environment | 7 | 3 |
| Most important accomplishments: | | |
| --were in non-professional areas | 5 | 2 |
| --included increases in over-all professional experiences | 8 | 5 |
| --included the attainment of a greater understanding of American way of life, of American values | 12 | 8 |
| --included forming new relations with fellow professionals | 8 | 4 |
| --included acquiring first-hand knowledge of U.S. | 13 | 9 |

Table 13.2 (cont'd)

Perceived Accomplishments and Satisfactions

| Items that Discriminate | Europeans | Non-Europeans |
|---|---|---|
| Fourth Interview (cont'd) | | |
| The American sojourn has produced a change in his perspective about: | | |
| --America, its institutions and people | 12 | 7 |
| --his home country | 8 | 12 |
| --the role of broadcasting in his home country | 8 | 4 |
| --his own professional role | 4 | 8 |
| Post-Return Interview | | |
| Changes in his position or responsibilities: | | |
| --were not expected | 9 | 6 |
| --have not occurred | 6 | 3 |
| --were due to changes in the organization | 3 | 0 |
| --were due to political considerations | 1 | 4 |
| --were due to career considerations | 0 | 4 |
| His own job satisfaction: | | |
| --has remained static | 9 | 2 |
| --has increased | 2 | 7 |
| --has increased because of the recognition granted his abilities | 0 | 5 |
| Has introduced innovations or changes | 8 | 11 |
| Innovations he has introduced include: | | |
| --changes in program style | 5 | 2 |
| --changes of a technical nature | 4 | 0 |
| --new types of programs | 7 | 4 |
| --increased use of indigenous personnel and material | 0 | 3 |
| --introduction of research into audience reactions | 0 | 3 |
| Effects of the sojourn on his professional activities: | | |
| --were moderate | 5 | 9 |
| --were nil | 3 | 0 |
| --included enhancement of professional skills | 6 | 9 |
| --included increased contact with U.S. broadcasters and networks | 3 | 0 |
| Encountered problems upon return | 2 | 7 |
| Encountered non-professional problems upon return | 0 | 5 |
| Found the sojourn more satisfying than dissatisfying | 9 | 12 |

Table 13.2 (cont'd)

| Perceived Accomplishments and Satisfactions<br>Items that Discriminate | Europeans | Non Europeans |
|---|---|---|
| **Post-Return Interview (cont'd)** | | |
| American sojourn enabled him: | | |
| --to increase his American contacts markedly | 7 | 1 |
| --to increase his contacts with American networks | 11 | 4 |
| --to increase his contacts with visiting American broadcasters | 3 | 0 |
| --to increase his contacts with professionals from other countries besides America | 6 | 1 |
| --to increase his contact with American foundations and universities | 2 | 5 |
| Was disappointed by sojourn because couldn't work at a station | 3 | 0 |
| Felt that sojourn exceeded expectations because: | | |
| --was able to travel throughout U.S. | 10 | 6 |
| --was able to learn about educational TV | 0 | 5 |
| Particularly enjoyable aspects of the sojourn were: | | |
| --the travel period | 9 | 6 |
| --the chance to travel through the country and meet average Americans | 6 | 2 |
| --the chance to see the beauty of the American countryside | 4 | 0 |
| Least satisfying aspect of the sojourn was: location at Brandeis | 4 | 1 |
| Has maintained contact with: | | |
| --broadcasters | 5 | 1 |
| --Brandeis staff | 5 | 2 |
| --friends and acquaintances | 9 | 12 |
| --other participants | 9 | 5 |

new learnings and redefines his professional role. The European maintains his distance; he is an interested observer of American broadcasting, as of American life in general, while the non-European seeks more active participation in a professional learning process.

This is not to say that the non-European is entirely caught up in professional pursuits. There are certain kinds of interpersonal relations that he seems to enjoy a little more than the European--such as contacts with "average" Americans and with fellow-participants. (The European seems to derive greater enjoyment from his contacts with American colleagues than the non-European; one suspects he finds it easier to establish a relationship on an equal footing with them.) The non-European is also more likely to gain a new perspective on his home country.

The post-return interview shows that the sojourn had a more marked professional impact upon the non-European, but left the European with greater contacts with America and with more enjoyable memories of the American countryside. Inspecting the discriminating items, we see that the Europeans less often expected or experienced changes in position or responsibilities. The non-European is more likely to report an increased degree of job satisfaction. He attributes this to the greater recognition that has been granted his abilities. These differences may well be due to the different situations in which the two groups function. The non-European often works in a younger organization, in which the process of change is swifter, as the system grows and as it engages in "decolonialization." The greater involvement the non-European showed in professional affairs while in America can be attributed to his more limited experience with broadcasting and his realization that the responsibilities he might well be called on to assume would require every bit of training he could acquire. Thus, the Seminar was to him an important source of new knowledge, highly relevant to his professional legitimation and his potential for career advancement. No doubt the changes in position and responsibilities experienced by the non-Europeans resulted from the rapid development of their organizations, but the American experience at least contributed to their ability to play an important role in this development. And they said as much in their interviews. Thus, they were more likely to see some effect of the American sojourn on their activities; to report that it enhanced their professional skills; and to appreciate what they had been able to learn about educational television.

The European reports less pleasure from the sojourn, and cites less professional sorts of gains. He notes that the sojourn enabled him to increase contacts with Americans, with American networks, with American broadcasters who visit his country, and with colleagues from other countries. He reports having particularly enjoyed the travel period and all that is associated with it.

In sum, it is evident that the two groups relate themselves very differently to their American experience. The Europeans are interested in observing--America as a country, American society, as well as American broadcasting. They derive enjoyment from this and they gain new understandings and insights into American life. Professionally, they watch, discuss, compare, and make new contacts, many of which they maintain after returning home. The non-Europeans regard the experience largely as a professional experience, designed to enhance their specific professional knowledge and skills. They are thus more eager than the Europeans to be actively involved in professional learning. In retrospect they tend to feel that they have accomplished this and that the Seminar has had some real impact on their professional skills and activities.

## Reactions to the Seminar in General

The strongest finding in Table 13.3 is the dissatisfaction of the Europeans with the composition of the group. In the first interview, they express the fear that the diversity of backgrounds might lower the level of discussion and instruction; in the fourth interview, they suggest that the Seminar might be improved by selecting a more homogeneous group, and are less likely than the non-Europeans to feel that a useful feature of the Seminar was the interchange between participants.

The Europeans are more likely, in general, to express criticisms of the Seminar's goals. They feel that future seminars could benefit from a clarification of goals, as well as from improvement in the professional portions of the proceedings. Yet, by and large, they do not complain very much about specific procedures. They seemed to like the trips to communication facilities, and the discussions with visiting speakers. They felt that the organizers of the Seminar were well-acquainted with the situation in their home countries, and also that they had received a well-balanced picture on all topics.

The non-Europeans seem more satisfied with the over-all goals and conception, but are more critical of certain specific procedures. They would have liked to see a fuller utilization of participants' talents; more opportunities for individual presentations by participants; a reduction of the time devoted to lectures; and better timing of the travel period so that it would not coincide with vacations of the people they would have liked to see.

It seems that the Europeans are dissatisfied with the general conception of the Seminar--largely, one would suppose, because of the heterogeneity of the group. They seem to feel that, given this composition, it cannot become a productive professional exchange and so they no longer dwell on specific criticisms of the way the Seminar was conducted. One senses a certain degree of disengagement. The non-Europeans, on the other hand, seem to be very much engaged. They are satisfied with the general conception of the Seminar, but would like to see it operate more effectively. Specifically, they would like to have less passive exposure to speakers and tours, and more active involvement in exchange around specific professional issues.

These appear to be the trends, although the differences between the two groups are not very striking here. Perhaps we can gain a clearer picture from the next table, which deals specifically with reactions to the university phase of the sojourn.

Table 13.3

## REACTIONS TO THE SEMINAR IN GENERAL

| Items that Discriminate | Europeans | Non-Europeans |
|---|---|---|
| **First Interview** | | |
| Advance briefings and information were inadequate | 2 | 5 |
| Books arrived late, if at all | 2 | 6 |
| Planning of trip to U.S. was not adequate | 0 | 5 |
| Goals of selection seemed to be: | | |
| --people with special professional competence | 6 | 3 |
| --people from countries covering a spectrum of broadcasting development | 5 | 1 |
| Was unclear about criteria for group composition | 1 | 6 |
| Fears that diversity of backgrounds may lower level of discussion and instruction | 5 | 0 |
| **Second Interview** | | |
| Was bored by trips to communications facilities | 0 | 4 |
| **Fourth Interview** | | |
| Believed that major Seminar goals included exposure to a survey of American ideas | 8 | 4 |
| Was dissatisfied with some Seminar goals | 6 | 3 |
| Felt that travel should not have come during vacation period | 2 | 5 |
| Feels individual participants should have more chance to talk to the group | 6 | 3 |
| Feels that the talents of individual participants were gravely under-utilized | 1 | 5 |
| Feels that future Seminars should provide time for individual presentations | 0 | 3 |
| Feels that Seminar organizers didn't understand his individual needs, weren't well acquainted with the situation in his homeland | 1 | 4 |
| Feels he was given a well-balanced picture on all topics | 8 | 5 |
| Feels that selection in the future should work for more specialization of interests | 5 | 2 |
| Feels most useful parts of Seminar were: | | |
| --lectures relating to own particular interests | 7 | 4 |
| --discussions with broadcasters | 3 | 0 |
| --exchange of information and ideas with other participants | 2 | 5 |
| Seminars could be improved by: | | |
| --changing selection procedures to insure greater homogeneity | 9 | 2 |
| --clarifying Seminar aims | 6 | 1 |
| --improving the professional portions | 5 | 1 |
| --reducing amount of time spent in lectures | 2 | 7 |

## Reactions to the University Phase

The discriminating items of Table 13.4 underline in considerable detail the distinctions that have already been made and add a bit to them. We find, in the second interview, that the Europeans were quite vocal about their disappointment in the level of professional exchange, a shortcoming that they attribute to the poor background of other participants. We find that the Europeans appreciate the fact that they have been provided with top-flight speakers. We find that the Europeans would have liked to make more contributions of their own than the situation permitted, but nevertheless emerged more satisfied with the role that they did play. The non-Europeans are shown to have been quite appreciative of the opportunity to acquire professionally relevant information.

Let us inspect the items in more detail. First we find that it is more often non-Europeans who say that the Seminar has come up to, or exceeded, expectations, with the Europeans pointing up defects--that there have been administrative failures (a reference presumably to the lack of facilities or time in which to present participants' own programs), that some professional seminars covered low-level material, and that the level of professional exchange among participants has been too low. On the other hand, the Europeans appreciate the tours of communication facilities and the quality of the speakers--which seems consistent with their greater interest in observing and hearing about American broadcasting, and meeting American broadcasters.

Again, there were Europeans who were hampered by language difficulties, this both at the academic and the professional seminars. Otherwise the Europeans seemed pleased at the academic seminars; they felt satisfied with the roles they played there and enjoyed them as a chance to learn about America. They were definitely less likely than the non-Europeans to find the professional seminars useful and relevant. Many more non-Europeans found the professional seminars useful because they presented large amounts of material that would help them in their own future work. In short, for the non-Europeans the professional seminars have a great deal of potential relevance. The Europeans do not see much professional value in them, but they enjoy them when they provide the opportunity to meet and listen to highly qualified broadcasters.

The Europeans were more likely to be clearly satisfied with their own contributions to the Seminar. More of them had been able to present special programs of their own to the group. Nevertheless, they may have had some slight resentment of the inadequate time and facilities for giving presentations and more of them complain about not having had adequate opportunity to help shape the course of the Seminar. It may be that what they are primarily concerned about is not so much the passive role as such, but the relatively limited opportunity to make contributions of their own: in other words, we might suggest in line with our other findings, that they do not mind listening to others (if these others have something interesting to say), but they would also like to have others listen to them. Participatory exchange as such, however, seems to be more important to the non-Europeans. And when the non-Europeans

Table 13.4

## REACTIONS TO THE BRANDEIS PERIOD

| Items that Discriminate | Europeans | Non-Europeans |
|---|---|---|
| **Second Interview** | | |
| The actuality of the Seminar has come up to, or exceeded expectations | 1 | 4 |
| Defects of the Seminar included: | | |
| --a lower level of professional exchange between participants than had been anticipated | 5 | 0 |
| --administrative failures in organization | 6 | 3 |
| Good aspects of the Seminar have included: | | |
| --the quality of the speakers | 5 | 2 |
| --the value of the tours | 4 | 1 |
| At least 75% of the sessions were of value | 7 | 4 |
| Some professional seminars covered low-level material | 3 | 0 |
| At the academic seminars: | | |
| --was fully satisfied with own role | 9 | 6 |
| --felt hampered by language difficulties | 3 | 0 |
| --enjoyed the opportunity to learn about America | 11 | 8 |
| Professional seminars seemed clearly useful and relevant | 7 | 13 |
| Felt hampered at professional seminars: | | |
| --by language difficulties | 3 | 0 |
| --by lack of professional knowledge | 0 | 3 |
| Professional seminars: | | |
| --lacked depth, dealt excessively in generalities | 3 | 0 |
| --were adversely affected by inadequacies of Seminar organizers and staff | 5 | 2 |
| Good features of the professional seminars included: | | |
| --the presentation of large amounts of information that will help the respondent in his own work | 3 | 11 |
| --the effectiveness of presentations | 0 | 3 |
| --the high quality of speakers | 6 | 3 |
| Was well satisfied with own countribution to Seminar | 5 | 2 |
| Felt hampered by language difficulties | 3 | 0 |
| Was able to present special program of own to the group | 7 | 2 |
| Time to absorb material was inadequate | 6 | 9 |
| Time utilitzation was poorly planned, in that: | | |
| --daily schedules were unbalanced | 5 | 2 |
| --time was not preserved for presentation of own programs by participants | 4 | 1 |

Table 13.4 (cont'd)

| Reactions to the Brandeis Period<br>Items that Discriminate | Europeans | Non-Europeans |
|---|---|---|
| Second Interview (cont'd) | | |
| Good planning was shown in: | | |
| --the weekend visit to the American family in New Hampshire | 5 | 9 |
| --the provision of highly skilled broadcasting people as speakers | 5 | 2 |
| Was personally inconvenienced by: | | |
| --inadequate provisions for leisure time | 5 | 2 |
| --inadequate provisions of audio-visual facilities for showing of own films and slides | 4 | 0 |
| Participants didn't have enough opportunity to determine the course of the Seminar | 8 | 5 |
| Had low estimate of contributions by other participants | 3 | 0 |
| Especially appreciated the technically superior presentations of special programs by representatives of advanced nations | 5 | 11 |
| Feels that the multi-national composition of group: | | |
| --will be beneficial | 5 | 8 |
| --may have mixed consequences | 8 | 4 |
| Adverse effects of multi-national composition would be due to diversity of professional backgrounds, positions, interests | 9 | 3 |
| Feels that participant group was quite congenial | 3 | 8 |
| Group cohesiveness was hindered by: | | |
| --personal idiosyncrasies | 6 | 2 |
| --lack of common interests | 3 | 0 |
| Dissatisfied with social aspects of Brandeis period | 3 | 6 |
| Felt that there had not been enough opportunity for sponaneous socializing | 5 | 8 |
| Was bored by recreational trips, such as July Fourth outing | 4 | 1 |
| Spent free time: | | |
| --alone | 2 | 5 |
| --at theatres and concerts | 9 | 6 |
| --in visits to American families | 9 | 1 |

complain about under-utilization of participants' talents, they may be referring less to their own talents than to those of some of their fellow-participants. Many of them mention that they especially appreciated the technically superior presentations of special programs by representatives of advanced countries.

The Europeans do not share the non-Europeans' sense of harassment; while they would like more leisure time and feel that daily schedules are unbalanced, they less often have the feeling that they lack the time to absorb the material that has been presented in seminars.

The Europeans' reservations about the composition of the group are obvious in this table. Some of them indicate that they have a low estimate of the contributions of other participants; a larger number feel that having a multi-national group is not an unmixed blessing. They point out that the diversity of professional backgrounds, positions, and interests may have adverse effects. Non-Europeans, by contrast, are more often sure that multi-national groups cannot help but be advantageous. They feel that the participant group is quite a congenial one--but the Europeans disagree, and point to the lack of common interests and to the personal idiosyncrasies that prevent the group from really pulling together.

Again, then, we find that the Europeans are not happy about the group composition and do not regard the Seminar as an opportunity for productive professional exchange. What they do appreciate are speakers and tours that allow them to learn about American broadcasting, but they are equally appreciative of academic seminars that allow them to learn about American society. They do like to make contributions of their own, because they feel they have contributions to make. Non-Europeans, on the other hand, are vitally interested in the professional seminars as a source of information that has potential applicability to their own situations. Their interest in exchange and active participation, which we noted earlier, is based largely on a desire to make the experience most directly relevant to specific professional concerns.

Table 13.4 also provides some information about social aspects of the experience during the university phase. Non-Europeans tended to be more dissatisfied with this aspect of the experience. They complained that there had not been enough opportunity for spontaneous socializing. They had markedly fewer opportunities to spend time in visits to American families. The weekend spent with an American family in New Hampshire elicited more spontaneous praise from the non-Europeans than it did from the Europeans. Thus, it is clear that they would have enjoyed closer interactions with Americans, but it seems that not many opportunities presented themselves.

## Reactions to the Travel Period

Apropos of the last point, we find in Table 13.5 that during the travel period the non-Europeans spontaneously made many American acquaintances. The reason for the difference is not clear, but it may well be that the Europeans had a larger number of prior contacts or mutual acquaintances and were thus less dependent on spontaneous

### Table 13.5

### REACTIONS TO THE TRAVEL PERIOD

| Items that Discriminate | Europeans | Non-Europeans |
|---|---|---|
| Third Interview | | |
| Highly satisfied with the travel experience | 11 | 7 |
| Found travel period to be free of trouble | 10 | 7 |
| Hotel accommodations were acceptable | 12 | 9 |
| Itinerary was fully satisfactory | 7 | 4 |
| Had trouble cashing Brandeis checks | 7 | 3 |
| Summer curtailment prevented the viewing of particular operations of interest | 5 | 1 |
| Felt positive about the tour because: | | |
| --it gave him a good over-all picture of the great variety and range of American broadcasting | 11 | 5 |
| --it had taken him to places that were professionally relevant | 9 | 12 |
| --he met fellow-professionals who had been very helpful | 5 | 12 |
| Had made comments and suggestions to staff at the stations he had visited | 8 | 5 |
| Had met local Americans: | | |
| --through prearrangement on own initiative | 8 | 5 |
| --in large numbers, spontaneously | 6 | 11 |
| Had traveled with a companion | 8 | 3 |

contacts and had less time for them. In any event, there is no question that the non-Europeans were quite capable of establishing contacts and were, despite their task-orientation, quite interested in doing so.

By and large, the Europeans seem to be somewhat more satisfied with the travel experience than the non-Europeans. This despite the fact that more of them were prevented from visiting certain facilities because of curtailed summer schedules. This did not seem to matter to them, since they did not take the accomplishment of specific professional tasks as part of their agenda. They were satisfied with the trip because it allowed them to make the observations they were interested in--to obtain a good over-all picture of the great variety and range of American broadcasting. At the stations they visited they probably had the opportunity to interact with their counterparts as equals, as evidence by their report that they made comments and suggestions to the staff.

The non-European, by contrast, was more oriented, in line with our repeated observation, to the accomplishment of certain specific professional tasks. Thus, he tended to be positive about his travel experience because it took him to places that were professionally relevant and allowed him to meet fellow-professionals who were helpful to him.

## Perceptions and Evaluations of America and Americans

A long list of items, presented in Table 13.6, show the differences in the way the two groups perceive and evaluate America and its people. Items from the first and second interviews, prior to the field trip, are not too engrossing. Europeans report more positive emotions upon first arrival, and at the second interview say that they have become even more positive. Non-Europeans cite more prior acquaintance with Americans, both in terms of friendships and professional contacts. Participants have received some jolts to their stereotypes by the time of the second interview. Some Europeans are now surprised to find that America is not uniformly well-organized; some non-Europeans are surprised to find that not all Whites hate Negroes. More non-Europeans than Europeans report that they are impressed by American kindliness.

Almost all of the items coming from the third interview reflect the greater differentiation with which the European has looked at America. The European has noted regional differences that he did not expect; these regional differences have focused on the ease of getting to know people, on political thought, and on social customs. He feels that these regional differences have a significant impact on American domestic policies. He has also noted religious differences and feels that they have a significant impact on American life, and he has more closely observed economic affairs.

At three different points in this interview our raters indicated that European discussions of American life and particularly of internal differences within America seemed broad and differentiated, while non-European discussions seemed narrow and superficial.

Table 13.6

## PERCEPTIONS AND EVALUATIONS OF AMERICA AND AMERICANS

| Items that Discriminate | Europeans | Non-Europeans |
|---|---|---|
| **First Interview** | | |
| Has previously had personal contact with fifteen or more Americans | 5 | 9 |
| Has had close American friends | 6 | 9 |
| Has worked closely with Americans in professional context | 3 | 8 |
| Has close friends who have lived in America | 8 | 12 |
| First reactions to America upon arrival here: | | |
| --positive | 9 | 6 |
| --mixed | 4 | 7 |
| **Second Interview** | | |
| Feelings about the United States | | |
| --have become more positive | 7 | 1 |
| --are unchanged | 2 | 8 |
| America is surprising in that: | | |
| --it is not as well-organized as expected | 3 | 0 |
| --not all Whites hate Negroes | 0 | 3 |
| Is impressed by American kindliness | 3 | 6 |
| Outstanding unanswered questions include: | | |
| --the state of U.S. broadcasting | 5 | 1 |
| --details of the U.S. educational system | 5 | 2 |
| **Third Interview** | | |
| Emotions about America: | | |
| --are clearly positive | 11 | 7 |
| --have become more positive since leaving Brandeis | 9 | 5 |
| Held at least a relatively close relationship (such as house guest) to a professional counterpart in America | 9 | 6 |
| Has noted unexpected regional differences | 9 | 5 |
| Found regional differences in: | | |
| --the ease with which one could get to know people | 6 | 3 |
| --political thought | 4 | 1 |
| --social customs | 6 | 2 |
| Feels that regional differences: | | |
| --affect American life in important ways | 6 | 2 |
| --have their main impact on American comestic policies | 9 | 4 |
| His discussions of regional differences strike our raters as being: | | |
| --broad in scope | 4 | 0 |
| --differentiated | 3 | 0 |
| Feels that religious differences affect American life in important ways | 8 | 5 |

Table 13.6 (cont'd)

Perceptions and Evaluations of America and Americans

| Items that Discriminate | Europeans | Non-Europeans |
|---|---|---|
| Third Interview (Cont'd) | | |
| Feels that racial and ethnic differences affect American foreign policy as well as domestic policy | 3 | 6 |
| His discussions of American internal differences strike our raters as being: | | |
| --narrow in scope | 1 | 8 |
| --superficial | 1 | 7 |
| Has focused some of his observations of American life on economic affairs | 11 | 4 |
| His discussions of American life in general strike our raters as being: | | |
| --narrow | 3 | 6 |
| --superficial | 1 | 5 |
| Feels that he has gained: | | |
| --a better understanding of the underlying character and philosophy of America as a country | 9 | 5 |
| --an understanding of the importance of the diversity and variety of America | 6 | 2 |
| Has been deeply disappointed by American handling of racial problems | 2 | 7 |
| Has been pleased by: | | |
| --the beauty of the American countryside | 5 | 2 |
| --America's democratic atmosphere | 4 | 1 |
| His impressions of America are favorable | 12 | 9 |
| Fourth Interview | | |
| Feels sorry to be leaving America | 3 | 0 |
| Post-Return Interview | | |
| Presented programs about America during the year that: | | |
| --were documentaries or special features | 9 | 6 |
| --were newscasts or editorials | 2 | 6 |
| --were personal reports | 5 | 8 |
| --dealt with places and personalities of special interest | 7 | 3 |
| --dealt with the racial situation | 7 | 3 |
| --emphasized America's diversity and heterogeneity | 7 | 2 |
| --emphasized the complexity of America and its problems | 6 | 3 |
| --discussed the inaccuracy of the popular image of America | 0 | 4 |
| --discussed the wealth and high living standards of America | 0 | 3 |
| --dealt with the generosity and hospitality of Americans | 1 | 4 |

Table 13.6 (cont'd)

Perceptions and Evaluations of America and Americans

| Items that Discriminate | Europeans | Non-Europeans |
|---|---|---|
| Post-Return Interview | | |
| (Continuation of "Presented programs about American during the year that"): | | |
| --used only a few, general sources | 7 | 10 |
| --relied on official overseas American sources | 8 | 5 |
| --relied on home country news media | 3 | 0 |
| Was favorably impressed by: | | |
| --America's wealth and technological advances | 6 | 10 |
| --the ability of Americans to criticize and to oppose | 1 | 4 |
| --America's progress in race relations | 0 | 3 |
| --the beauty of America | 4 | 1 |
| Was unfavorably impressed by: | | |
| --American inefficiency and poor organization | 5 | 0 |
| --the extent and severity of America's racial problem | 2 | 9 |
| Reported, upon return: | | |
| --America's diversity and heterogeneity | 4 | 1 |
| --the inaccuracy of popular image of America | 0 | 3 |
| --the wealth of America | 1 | 6 |
| Names as those Americans who would differ in impression of respondent's home country: | | |
| --those who have differing levels of education | 6 | 2 |
| --those who have had differing degrees of contact with homeland | 3 | 6 |
| Feels that America is so complex that one cannot speak of such a thing as a single American point of view | 7 | 4 |
| American subgroups that would differ in point of view: | | |
| --can be identified | 9 | 5 |
| --would divide in terms of education | 8 | 4 |
| --would divide in terms of region of domicile | 6 | 0 |

The European more often feels that he has gained a better understanding of America's basic ethos, and of the importance of the diversity and variety of the nation. He is pleased, moreover, by the country's democratic atmosphere and by the physical beauty of the countryside. The non-European, in contrast, is more likely than the European to have become deeply distressed by America's handling of the racial problem. It is not surprising that the third interview indicates that Europeans continue to be somewhat more favorable toward America; more of them report unambivalently positive emotions, and more of them report that their feelings have become more positive since leaving the university.

The post-return interview finds the non-Europeans in a more approving mood than before, but otherwise not much is changed. Europeans emphasize the diversity and complexity of America; they appreciate the beauty of the landscape; but they are unfavorably impressed with signs of inefficiency and poor organization. Non-Europeans emphasize the inaccuracy of certain popular images of America; they are favorably impressed with America's wealth and technological advance, as well as by the ability of Americans to voice opposition and criticize themselves and their institutions; and they are distressed by the extent and severity of the racial problem, though pleased by America's progress in race relations.

Most participants had presented some sort of programs about America during the year. European programs had emphasized America's diversity and its complexity, had dealt with the racial situation, and had dealt with places and personalities of special interest. Non-European programs had spoken of the inaccuracy of popular images of America, of American prosperity and high living standards, and of the generosity and hospitality of Americans.

The remaining items show that Europeans more often believe that America is so complex and so diverse, that one cannot speak in a meaningful way about some single point of view as the American point of view. Numerous points of view can be identified, each associated with a different subgroup -- for example, different in region or education -- within American society.

The specific aspects of American life and society on which the two groups seemed to focus can easily be understood in terms of the differences in background and interest that they bring to the experience. The striking difference, of course, is the greater degree of complexity and differentiation in the images held by Europeans -- which is consistent with our earlier finding that the Europeans show more change in differentiation in their questionnaire responses. This difference may well be understood in terms of some of the factors mentioned in the preceding chapter: the greater cultural similarity which makes it easier for Europeans to engage in searching interactions with Americans (although there is a subgroup of our European participants who are handicapped by language barrier) and the availability of a better articulated framework into which information about the United States can be assimilated. Perhaps another reason for the difference between the two groups in the degree of differentiation is that the Europeans, as we have seen throughout this chapter, are more oriented toward observing American society and understanding its character. It is not surprising, therefore, that they emerge with a more complex understanding of American than

## Table 13.7

## PERCEPTIONS AND EVALUATIONS OF AMERICAN BROADCASTING

| Items that Discriminate | Europeans | Non-Europeans |
|---|---|---|
| **Second Interview** | | |
| Surprised by: | | |
| --the lowly role of radio in America | 4 | 1 |
| --value and virility of American press | 1 | 4 |
| **Third Interview** | | |
| Has seen American broadcasting approaches that are clearly applicable at home | 0 | 3 |
| Feels that American handling of children's programs would be adaptable at home | 0 | 3 |
| Feels that homeland should shun the American practice of breaking up news programs with commercials | 4 | 9 |
| Feels that American broadcasters: | | |
| --are among the best in the world | 1 | 5 |
| --have excellent working conditions | 1 | 4 |
| --are meeting their responsibilities well | 0 | 4 |
| --fail to meet a responsibility to the audience | 11 | 8 |
| --fail to meet a responsibility to themselves | 3 | 0 |
| --are overly constrained by the pressures of advertisers | 7 | 3 |
| --are making an effort to solve their major problems | 4 | 0 |
| Feels that major successes of U.S. broadcasting include the documentaries and the experimental programs of the major networks | 6 | 1 |
| Feels that major problems of American broadcasting include: | | |
| --lack of balance in programming | 9 | 3 |
| --fear of government control | 5 | 1 |
| --lack of funds for educational programs | 3 | 6 |
| Was surprised to find that some American stations work with poor technical equipment | 4 | 0 |
| Feels that private ownership of broadcasting: | | |
| --has some advantages | 3 | 6 |
| --may have some advantages for America, but not for home country | 4 | 1 |
| --has no advantages | 6 | 4 |
| --is suited to the special conditions of American society | 3 | 6 |
| --provides a higher degree of freedom in choosing and organizing programs | 1 | 5 |
| --frustrates efforts to raise the level of public taste | 10 | 4 |
| Feels that there is definitely a conflict between the requirements of making a profit and the provision of public service | 8 | 4 |

Table 13.7 (cont'd)

Perceptions and Evaluations of American Broadcasting

| Items that Discriminate | Europeans | Non-Europeans |
|---|---|---|
| **Third Interview (cont'd)** | | |
| Feels that Americans are aware of the problems deriving from private ownership but are doing little to solve them | 9 | 6 |
| Feels that FCC should be given more power, in an effort to alleviate problems due to private ownership | 3 | 0 |
| Feels that the development of American broadcasting has been influenced by internal differences within the country | 10 | 7 |
| These internal differences have been: | | |
| --regional | 4 | 0 |
| --religious | 4 | 0 |
| --socio-economic | 7 | 2 |
| **Fourth Interview** | | |
| Upon return home: | | |
| --will praise American broadcasting | 0 | 8 |
| --will present a mixed evaluation of American broadcasting | 10 | 0 |
| **Post-Return Interview** | | |
| Is confirmed in his preference for public, non-commercial control of broadcasting | 5 | 2 |
| Views American broadcasters: | | |
| --with mixed feelings | 5 | 2 |
| --in an essentially favorable light | 6 | 11 |
| Favorably impressed by adequacy of funds for American broadcasting | 0 | 3 |
| Feels that American broadcasting: | | |
| --could be more effective | 3 | 0 |
| --suffers from an excess of commercial interference | 3 | 0 |
| Feels that American broadcasters: | | |
| --are more competent than those at home | 1 | 4 |
| --enjoy more opportunities for reward and advancement than those at home | 6 | 3 |
| Reported, upon return, the advantages of certain American broadcasting techniques | 9 | 2 |

By contrast, ten Europeans, but not a single non-European, anticipate that they will present a mixed evaluation, citing some good features and some bad ones. The more global approval of the non-Europeans, as compared to the more differentiated approval of the Europeans is then quite evident.

After return the European continues to have a more ambivalent feeling about American broadcasters, while the non-European views them in an essentially favorable light. The European feels that American broadcasting could be more effective, that it suffers from commercial interference; he is confirmed in his preference for public control. He does, however, report more often upon the advantages of certain American broadcasting techniques. Thus again we see that the European singles out for praise certain specific features of American broadcasting that he considers particularly successful or effective -- whether these be special kinds of programs, or certain special techniques. About the over-all structure, direction, and quality of American broadcasting, however, he has many reservations.

## Participants' Views on International Exchange, on Their Home Countries, and on Their Own Broadcasting Systems

From Table 13.8 we learn that Europeans more often feel that they could contribute to international exchange by communicating their knowledge in a particular area of professional competence. Similarly, they are more prone to feel that their own broadcasting systems can make major contributions to international exchange and the development of broadcasting elsewhere, especially by drawing on their experience in educational broadcasting. They feel positive about the potential contributions of other countries to the development of broadcasting in their own countries -- contributions in the form of program ideas, program exchanges, or the training of personnel. Non-Europeans believe that international exchange could help in the training of their broadcasters by sharpening their technical skills and by increasing their knowledge of media in other countries. While the non-European feels that his own broadcasting system could not make major contributions in return, he suggests that it could help others concretely in the preparation of programs about his home country.

Table 13.9 shows that non-Europeans have become more aware of the limitations of their countries with respect to education, technology, and living standards; of the need for more rapid advance in these areas; as well as of the potential for such advances. Changes in a European's view of his home country do not show a clear trend; the best one can say is that there is a hint of ambivalence about the country -- some things seem to look better now, and some worse.

Finally, Table 13.10 shows -- not surprisingly -- that the Europeans are somewhat more likely to point to features of their own broadcasting systems that America could do well to adopt. They feel, for example, that their radio systems, unlike America's, offer good drama. The non-Europeans are even more emphatic than the Europeans, however, in the desire to maintain radio as an important force in their countries. They particularly appreciate its economy in both transmission and reception, relative to TV. After returning home, the European more often notes certain improvements in his broadcasting

Table 13.8

## VIEWS ON INTERNATIONAL EXCHANGE

| Items that Discriminate | Europeans | Non-Europeans |
|---|---|---|
| **Fourth Interview** | | |
| Believes international exchange makes possible a mutually beneficial exchange of professional information | 5 | 2 |
| Believes he could contribute to international exchange by communicating his own professional knowledge in some area | 5 | 1 |
| **Post-Return Interview** | | |
| Other countries could aid home system by offering: | | |
| --program ideas | 5 | 1 |
| --the exchange of programs | 10 | 5 |
| --the training of personnel | 9 | 5 |
| International exchange could help home broadcasters: | | |
| --by improving their technical skills | 7 | 10 |
| --by increasing their knowledge of media in other countries | 1 | 4 |
| Home system's contribution to international exchange: | | |
| --can be major | 4 | 1 |
| --can derive from its special experience in educational broadcasting | 5 | 0 |
| --can take the form of aiding others to make programs about the home country | 1 | 4 |

Table 13.9

## PERCEPTIONS AND EVALUATIONS OF OWN COUNTRY

| Items that Discriminate | Europeans | Non-Europeans |
|---|---|---|
| **Second Interview** | | |
| American experience yields more positive perspective on home country | 6 | 3 |
| American experience: | | |
| --shows need for more rapid advance in education in home country | 0 | 4 |
| --shows the homeland's potential for growth and progress | 1 | 5 |
| **Fourth Interview** | | |
| Sees now that homeland has a great potential for economic and political development | 0 | 5 |
| **Post-Return Interview** | | |
| American experience makes him: | | |
| --appreciate some things about the homeland less | 3 | 0 |
| --more aware of the limitations of the homeland in terms of education, technology, and living standards | 0 | 6 |

Table 13.10

## PERCEPTIONS AND EVALUATIONS OF OWN COUNTRY'S BROADCASTING SYSTEM

| Items that Discriminate | Europeans | Non-Europeans |
|---|---|---|
| **Third Interview** | | |
| Feels that home broadcasting system has features that America would do well to adopt | 10 | 7 |
| Feels that radio will remain and should remain an important force in homeland | 9 | 12 |
| Feels that homeland's radio system, unlike America's, offers good drama | 4 | 0 |
| Feels that radio has advantages, including: | | |
| --economy of transmission | 3 | 8 |
| --economy of reception | 3 | 8 |
| --a better capacity to present programs that call for imagination | 5 | 2 |
| **Post-Return Interview** | | |
| Has noted improvements this year in home system's equipment and technology | 5 | 2 |
| Is dissatisfied with present direction of development of home system | 4 | 1 |
| Sees need for home system: | | |
| --to make technical advances | 5 | 1 |
| --to expand services | 5 | 2 |
| --to increase its use of media for educational purposes | 6 | 9 |
| --to increase its use of indigenous personnel | 0 | 3 |

system's equipment and technology; on the other hand, he is more likely to be disturbed about the direction that the development of broadcasting at home is currently taking, and to feel that the system needs yet to make technical advances and to expand its services. The non-Europeans more often note that their systems need to increase the use of indigenous personnel and the employment of the media in educational pursuits.

## Europeans vs. Non-Europeans: A Summary

There is always a danger in the comparison between two groups because it is easy to overlook the tremendous amount of variation within each group and overlap between them. It is particularly important to keep this caveat in mind here, since many of the differences we have noted are based on a small proportion of the cases. There is a clear suggestion in these data, however, of a distinct European pattern and a distinct non-European one, although it is equally clear that not all of our participants fit their respective patterns, and that none of them fits the pattern entirely.

The European, as he emerges from the data, comes to the American sojourn with a wider and less specific agenda. He is interested in seeing the country, in meeting people, and in broadening his understanding of American life and American society, as well as American broadcasting. He is not disinterested in an active exchange around specific professional issues, and this may well have been one of the experiences that he had hoped to have during the Seminar. He decides very quickly after his arrival, however, that the Seminar was not set up and the participants were not selected in such a way as to make possible a professional exchange at the level that he is interested in and considers himself qualified for. He does not seem deeply disappointed, though, and comfortably adopts the role of observer.

The European does not find the university phase of the Seminar very useful from a professional point of view. Even during the travel period, the professional aspects of the experience are not the ones that stand out as accomplishments and sources of enjoyment. He does enjoy the academic seminars at the university, which allow him to learn about American society; and he enjoys seeing the country, meeting people, and gaining new insights into America during the travel period. Even though he dwells on these non-professional sources of satisfaction, there is a strong professional component to his experience as well. But here too he takes the role of observer. At the university, he likes to hear the highly qualified speakers who are brought in; he likes to tour broadcasting facilities. During the travel period he appreciates getting a picture of the wide range and variety of American broadcasting. He is happy to observe, compare notes, and talk to fellow-broadcasters whom he meets at the university and during the trip. He enjoys these relationships best when they involve some give-and-take -- when he can discuss his own experiences on an equal footing with the Americans he meets. By the same token, he wants to have an opportunity to contribute to the Seminar -- for example, by presenting and discussing his own work. This interest in participation and in making contributions of his own, however, does not seem to be based, in his case, on the feeling that it would enhance his own professional development. Rather, it is based on the desire to make use of the special competence he can offer and to attain recognition for it.

By contrast, the non-European comes with a more limited and specific agenda. He is highly task-oriented. What he wants is to increase his professional skills and increase his acquaintance with broadcasting procedures that will be applicable to his home situation. He is much more satisfied with the professional activities at the university than the European. He sees them as relevant to his concerns and as an opportunity to achieve the learning that he is striving for. Where he is critical, it is because the Seminar does not provide as much opportunity as he would like for actual focusing on specific professional concerns, in very concrete and task-oriented fashion. He likes the opportunity for exchange with fellow-participants and would be happy to reduce the number of lectures in order to have more time for such exchanges. He asks for more active involvement of the participants in the Seminar and greater utilization of their talents -- not so much because he wants to make contributions of his own, but because he finds that he can benefit from the contributions of other Seminar participants. Opportunity to observe what Americans are doing and to learn descriptions of it, interesting though this may be, is not very useful from his point of view. He wants to know how he can apply these things to his own situation, and he is most eager for professional exchanges around specific problems that will maximize his directly applicable skills and knowledge.

In the travel period, the non-European, again, is more task-oriented, and locates his greatest satisfactions and accomplishments in the professional area. What he appreciates about his visits to broadcasting facilities is the opportunity they give him to acquire professionally relevant experiences and to meet fellow-professionals who are willing to be helpful to him. He is less eager for the reciprocal give-and-take conversations with American broadcasters that the European cherishes, and more eager for interactions that are instructive and informative in concrete ways. In painting this task-oriented picture of the non-European, we do not wish to imply that he has no interests other than the professional ones. He is interested in learning about America, but such learning is incidental and not a central part of his agenda. The same is true for the mere observation of American broadcasting activities in their own right. The non-European very definitely is interested in interpersonal encounters with Americans (as well as with fellow-participants). He seems to separate these, however, from professional and "learning" encounters more than the European does. The interactions that he seems to cherish particularly, and more so than the European, are those that represent a relationship from man-to-man, rather than from colleague-to-colleague.

The impact of the American experience seems to be different for the European and the non-European, and in line with their different expectations and goals and their different ways of relating themselves to the experience. The European did not expect the American visit to have much of an impact on his professional activities and he reports that it did not. There is one major exception here however: he wanted to establish professional and personal contacts with American colleagues, and he clearly succeeded in doing that, more so than the non-European. The most striking effect of the trip is the increased understanding of American society and differentiation of his image of America with which he comes away -- quite in keeping with the agenda that he had set for himself. On the whole his image of America is positive, though to place it on a simple pro-con dimension would do violence to its complexity. His attitude toward American broadcasting is also differentiated, but on the whole less positive. Quite reflectively, he singles out certain specific approaches and techniques of American broadcasting that he considers praiseworthy, while raising questions about its over-all structure and emphasis.

The non-European comes away with a highly favorable attitude toward American broadcasting. He seems to approve of it in rather global terms. This may reflect the fact that, unlike the European, he was not particularly interested in making comparisons between the American and other approaches. Rather, he was interested in extracting from American broadcasting things that would be useful in his own country and applicable to his own system. The major impact of the experience, for the non-European -- again, consistent with his particular agenda -- was in the professional area. He seems to feel that participation in the Seminar helped, at least in some measure, to enhance his skills, to increase his knowledge of relevant approaches and techniques, to redefine his professional role, and to advance his career.

It seems evident that the Seminar did not fully meet the special needs of either the Europeans or the non-Europeans. Yet it seemed to meet them sufficiently to make the experience, on the whole, a satisfying and meaningful one, and to produce an impact that still manifests itself a year later. What is important to note, in the present context, is that there seem to be different ways in which our international exchange experience of this sort can have value for its participants. What the Europeans and non-Europeans hoped to get out of the experience, what they did in the attempt to meet these goals, and what they finally achieved, were quite different, and yet both groups seem to have been at least moderately satisfied with their experience and both manifest significant effects -- each in its own way.

# CHAPTER 14

# CONCLUSION

The purposes of this evaluation study were (1) to assess the effectiveness of the Seminar in achieving its goals; and (2) to identify the specific features of the Seminar that were most successful and those that created difficulties, in order to be able to recommend arrangements and procedures that would enhance the effectiveness of similar seminars in the future. What have we learned from our findings that is relevant to these two research objectives?

Let us turn to the second objective first. Relevant information is derived primarily from the interviews held with participants while the Seminar was in progress (Chapters 4 and 6); this information was validated by data from the retrospective interviews (Chapter 7) and supplemented by group observations and reactions of the Seminar staff (Chapter 5). On the basis of this information,we have come up with a series of conclusions about the requisite conditions for a satisfying experience in a multi-national seminar. After presenting these conclusions we shall turn to those of our findings that can help us assess the effectiveness of the present Seminar in achieving its goals (Chapter 8-11). We shall draw out the implications that these findings, as well as our findings about the differential reactions of different subgroups (Chapters 12 and 13) have for international exchange experiences.

## Conditions for a Satisfying Exchange Experience

Our analysis has yielded several conclusions that should be applicable to a variety of situations involving international exchange. Each situation, of course, has some unique features and some special problems that have to be handled in terms of its own requirements. Much depends, for example, on the professional field with which a particular program is concerned, on the professional positions of the participants, on the range of countries represented, and on the setting in which the program is conducted. Nevertheless, there are certain general principles that should be relevant to most of these situations, even though they might take a different specific form in each case. We shall attempt to summarize some of these principles, which are suggested by our data and the interpretations that we have placed on them.

From the reactions of the participants to their experiences, one can draw some inferences about the major conditions that are likely to enhance their satisfaction. The conditions that we have identified are based on our analysis of the first three interviews, which focused (in part) on participants' reactions to the Seminar while it was still in progress. Analysis of the subsequent interviews confirmed our earlier conclusions and added only one major new element: they revealed an even greater emphasis, in the participants' retrospective reflections on their experience, on the importance of active participation and direct involvement in professional activities. Thus, these additional findings add further weight to the points about the importance of professional participation that are already stressed in the conditions we are about to present.

We shall list seven conditions that appear to have general applicability to multi-national programs. In planning and conducting such a program, it would be important to take these conditions into account and to structure the situation in a way that would be likely to maximize them. We shall refer to the aspects of the Seminar under study that have revealed the importance of each condition, and we shall try to draw out the implications of each condition for the organization of multi-national exchange programs.

(1) Relevance of the experience to the participant's specific professional concerns. Perhaps the key factor in a person's satisfaction with his experience abroad is how much value it has from the point of view of his specific professional concerns. His whole attitude to the experience is likely to be shaped by the extent to which it gives him an opportunity to exchange ideas and explore problems that are directly relevant to his work; the extent to which it provides him with new information that he can apply to his own professional situation;and the extent to which it enables him to establish contacts with colleagues in other countries who have similar interests, and thus lay the groundwork for future exchanges. There are many things in which a Seminar participant may be interested. He may enjoy learning about America in general, and about the American developments in his own professional field, in particular. In the final analysis, however, his satisfaction with the experience will depend on its relevance to his specific professional concerns.

The participants in the present Seminar enjoyed listening to American leaders in the field of broadcasting, and were particularly appreciative of the high quality of the invited speakers that were presented to them. Yet, some participants were not entirely satisfied because the organization of the professional seminars made it difficult to focus on specific issues of common concern, to delve more deeply into them, and to discuss them in detail. The presentation of what is happening in American broadcasting was interesting to them up to a point, but they also would have liked to use it as a springboard for detailed exploration of concrete professional problems of their own. Similarly, some participants were not entirely satisfied with their experiences in the field, because they saw too many stations for too short a period of time, without sufficient opportunity to observe their operations in detail. They were less interested in seeing facilities than they were in discussing specific problems in programming. They would have liked an opportunity to be attached to a station for a longer period of time, and actually work there alongside the regular staff or study its operations at close range. Participants who had this kind of opportunity were highly satisfied with their field experiences.

The implication of this point would seem to be that, in organizing an exchange program, one must go beyond the question: what can we show and tell the participants that would be of interest to them? The primary question should be: what can we enable them to do that will have concrete professional value for them? The problem is not only one of selecting lecturers they would like to hear and facilities they would like to see, but also one of deliberately and systematically structuring the program so that participants will have the opportunity to address themselves actively, along with American colleagues, to central issues in their work. What they can see and learn about American activities in their field is certainly valuable, but it should be more than a description of what is happening here and a display of facilities. It should be part of a more active process of exploration and exchange on common problems. The participants should be viewed not as professional sightseers, but as professional colleagues engaged in a professionally relevant enterprise.

If direct professional relevance is to serve as the guiding principle in organizing the Seminar, a number of more specific steps can be recommended: (a) Participants should be so selected that they will be relatively homogeneous in terms of a focal problem with which they are all professionally concerned. This criterion is not incompatible with having some diversity in background, experience, positions, and specific activities, as long as, at some level, there is a shared problem on which all participants can come together. (b) The professional part of the Seminar should be organized in terms of an integrating framework, built around issues related to the focal area of concern. This framework should be communicated to the participants in advance, so that they will know what to expect and what is expected of them, and will be able to prepare accordingly. (c) Deliberate attempts should be made to match activities with the specific interests and needs of the participants. During their stay at the university, this would mean providing opportunities for alternative activities on the part of different sub-groups in line with their special interests. For the field trip, it would mean finding out exactly what kinds of activities each participant would like to engage in and then selecting facilities that will make these activities available. (d) Both at the university and in the field, it is necessary to make some sacrifice in the number of offerings--the number of speakers invited, the number of facilities visited--in order to allow for longer and deeper exposure to each. This need not be an absolute rule, of course. There may be occasions when it is valuable to bring in some outstanding speakers or visit some outstanding facilities even though only a limited amount of time is available. (e) Exposure to American speakers and facilities should be of such a nature that participants will have ample opportunity to explore procedures and approaches in detail and to relate them to their own specific interests, problems, and experiences. During the stay at the university, this means that there should be time and encouragement to follow up each presentation with extended discussion and exchange, going beyond questions and answers into an actual sharing of experiences. During the field trip, it means that each participant should, if possible, be attached to at least one facility for a longer period of time and directly involved in its on-going activities. He may either take the role of a temporary staff member, or of an observer who can explore the operations of the facility in detail. (f) Even in the planning of those activities that are not specifically professional, it may be worthwhile to consider their possible professional relevance. Some participants may be interested in numerous aspects of American life; others, however, may be particularly interested in those aspects that touch on their professional specialties. In developing academic seminars and in arranging the non-professional side of the travel period, therefore, it would be important to keep in mind which aspects of American life are likely to interest the participants, given their particular professional concerns. Insofar as possible, it would be desirable to offer participants alternative academic seminars from which they can select those that are of the greatest interest to them.

We have dwelt at such length on the question of the professional relevance of the experience because we consider it a key to the participant's reaction to the experience as a whole. We would venture to predict that the extent to which the trip turned out to be a meaningful professional experience will affect not only the person's satisfaction with it at the moment, but also its longer-range impact on him. This should be so for several reasons. First of all, a satisfying experience is more conducive to a process of re-examination of one's assumptions and approaches. Thus, anything that has a marked effect on satisfaction should also have a marked effect on impact. Secondly, to the extent that the person is engaged in a meaningful professional experience, he will ipso facto be involved in an active process of thinking through his professional role and professional activities. The results of this process should then continue to manifest themselves when he comes back to his home situation. Finally, to the extent that he has been involved in a meaningful professional experience, he will have established actual links with colleagues from America and from other countries who participated in the experience with him. He would thus become part of a wider network of fellow-professionals, with whom he maintains contact and engages in exchange. Thus, the effects of the experience would enter directly into his subsequent professional life.

(2) The participant's opportunity for colleague-type relationships with his American counterparts. As we have indicated, most of the participants would like a relationship with their American colleagues that goes beyond listening to them speak, or asking them questions, or being shown their facilities. This is related to their desire for a professional experience directly germane to problems of specific concern to them. Such an experience presupposes a greater degree of discussion and exchange of ideas and experiences than the one-sided relationship of speaker to listener or guide to tourist makes possible. While the participants did not often mention this directly, there are good theoretical reasons for believing that more reciprocal, give-and-take relationships are valued not only because they are inherently more satisfying. Sometimes, this may involve a matter of status: the visitor may feel that his host does not really regard him as an equal with whom he can engage in a mutually beneficial exchange. From all indications, however, this feeling did not prevail among the specialists whom we interviewed. They were generally accorded very high status by the organizers of the Seminar, and by the colleagues they met both at the university and in the field. Moreover, they did not seem to mind being in the role of learner and observer. Nevertheless, it seems reasonable to suppose that there is a limit to how long one can sustain this role. Quite aside from status considerations, it is frustrating to remain for a long time in the role of spectator rather than participant, the role of recipient rather than contributor. A more active, give-and-take relationship with his American colleagues

would make the interaction intellectually more stimulating and interpersonally more rewarding. It would allow the participant to use his own potentialities to a greater extent and to experience the satisfaction that comes from establishing a personal contact. It is quite likely that our respondents' desire for more discussion after lectures and for greater involvement in the facilities they visited reflects, at least in part, a desire for more participatory, colleague-type relationships with their American counterparts.

The recommendations that we have already offered for making encounters with American colleagues, both at the university and in the field, longer and more intensive would go a long way to facilitate this type of relationship. We would go further, however, in recommending a more deliberate and more complete introduction of colleague-type relationships with Americans into the exchange program. Thus, during the period at the university, we would recommend the inclusion of several Americans as regular participants in the Seminar. Ideally, they would remain with the Seminar during the entire period, but there would be value in having them come even for a period of one or two weeks. The essential point is that they would come not as invited speakers, but as regular participants, who see themselves as involved in an exchange activity, rather than in mere information-giving. This is not meant to replace the procedure of bringing in American experts for short periods as speakers and resource persons, but rather to supplement it with another--more participatory--type of relationship with American colleagues.

During the field period, we would recommend that participants be encouraged, whenever possible, to become "participant observers" in at least one of the facilities they visit. If they can serve as temporary staff members, who are intimately involved in the on-going operations of the organization, then the experience is likely to be most rewarding. This may not always be feasible, but an attempt should be made to approximate this type of participation.

(3) The participant's opportunity to make personal contributions. A major source of satisfaction is the opportunity to be an active contributor, rather than just a recipient. Being able to make a contribution enhances a person's self-esteem. It gives him the reassuring feeling that he has something of value to give to others and that they are interested in what he has to offer. Moreover, it strengthens his feeling that his participation in the program is worthwhile in that his own talents and relevant experiences are not being wasted. Finally, as the participant contributes personally, the experience becomes more enriching for himself. He is able to relate what he hears to his own situation, he is stimulated to develop and formulate his ideas, and he is given the opportunity to try them out on others. On the practical side, when participants make personal contributions, others can become acquainted with their work and a basis for future interaction can thus be provided.

Some of our respondents mentioned that, during their stay at the university, their own contributions and the contributions of other participants were not being used as fully as possible. They were often prepared to contribute more than they were asked or encouraged to contribute. There was a general feeling that there was not enough exchange among the participants themselves. The fact that opportunities for personal contributions by the participants were not built into the program to any great extent was disappointing, not only because the participants were not able to contribute as much as they would have liked to, but also because they were not able to benefit as much from the contributions of other participants. In the field interviews, respondents did not express any feeling that their contributions were being under-utilized. It is quite possible, however, that this is part of the reason why they were not entirely satisfied with short touring-type visits, and why those individuals who were attached to facilities for longer periods of time, and more directly involved in their operations--and who, presumably, had greater opportunity to make personal contributions--generally expressed a high degree of satisfaction.

Again, the recommendations that we have already made for a more problem-oriented organization of the professional seminars and a more intensive involvement in facilities during the travel period, are also designed to enhance the participants' opportunity to make personal contributions. During the period at the university, if lectures are followed by opportunities for extensive discussion around concrete problems, participants are able to bring in their own relevant experiences, learn more about what each of them is doing and thinking, and get reactions from one another. We would further recommend that the program be so structured that participants whose experience is particularly relevant to the problem under study can be called upon to lead discussions,make presentations, or give demonstrations. It might also be a good idea to invite each participant to describe to the group the relevant professional developments in his own country. In this way, one could take fuller advantage both of the personal contributions of individual participants and of the multi-national character of the Seminar for the transmission of useful information.

Longer and more intensive involvement of the participants in the facilities they visit during the travel period would, of course, increase their opportunities for making personal contributions. This would be particularly true if they are actually working alongside their American counterparts. The organization to which the participant will be attached should be informed early and fully of his background and qualifications. This would give his colleagues an idea of the potential contributions that he could make to their program, and enable them to invite him to make these contributions.

(4) Availability to the participant of choice in activities and arrangements. Satisfaction is likely to be greatest if the person's activities and arrangements are not entirely pre-determined, but if he is given some freedom of movement so that he can pursue his own interests and maximize his own values. We have already mentioned the importance of providing the participant, insofar as possible, with choices in his professional and academic activities and in the facilities he visits during the travel period. The same considerations hold true for social, cultural, and recreational activities.

There are three inter-related ways in which the participant's choice of activities can be enhanced: (a) The range of opportunities made available to the individual can be generally broadened. This does not necessarily mean organizing a large variety of activities. It does mean, first of all, acquainting the participants with as many on-going activities as possible (e.g., various cultural and recreational events at the university and the neighboring community, and in the cities they will be visiting during the travel period), so that they can select the particular ones that are of interest to them. Secondly, it means facilitating arrangements for engaging in these activities, for example, by obtaining tickets and providing transportation. (b) Wherever possible, activities can be planned in such a way that the group can be broken down into smaller subgroups, in line with their diverse interests. This does not mean that there should be no activities for the total group, but it should be kept in mind that this is not always the most meaningful arrangement. If this principle is followed, participants will have genuine alternatives among which they can choose. Thus, in professional activities there should be some mechanisms for the formation of special interest groups around specific issues. Academic activities should consist of a series of offerings within which participants can choose. Organized social and recreational activities should be of different types, reflecting the differences in preference among the participants. (c) Finally, one can enhance choice by ensuring that "saying No" always remain an available alternative. It is important to watch out that an opportunity does not degenerate into an obligation. This can happen, for example, during the travel period if a heavy program of social activities is pre-arranged for a participant who would rather rest, or have privacy, or pursue his own interests.

The problem of choice also enters into some of the practical arrangements. It is important to keep in mind that meals, accommodations, transportation, etc., involve competing values to which different participants may assign different weights. One should not assume, therefore, that all participants would prefer the same arrangement. Rather, one should try to individualize arrangements as much as possible, and allow each participant to choose in terms of his own preference.

(5) Arrangement of the participant's schedule and facilities in line with his desired pattern of activities. It is obvious that a participant's satisfaction depends on his ability to do the things that he wants to do--or perhaps has to do. In working out a schedule and in arranging facilities, it is essential to take this criterion into account in a very deliberate way. Thus, it is not enough to think in terms of giving him certain blocks of time. One must consider in detail the kinds of activities in which he would want to engage during that time. The time is not very valuable unless it comes at a point at which he needs it and at which he can use it to maximum advantage, given the activities in which he wishes to engage. For example, in scheduling free time during the stay at the university, one should consider at what point this free time can be used most effectively in the context of the over-all program (e.g., at what point participants need time for absorbing new material, for reflection, or for relaxation) and in the light of the activities in which participants would want to engage (e.g., what blocks of time would these require and during which parts of the day). Similarly, in scheduling time in different cities during the travel period, one must make sure that the amount of time, and

the point at which it is introduced, are such as to make the desired activities possible and convenient. Similar considerations pertain to the arrangement of facilities. It is essential not only to provide facilities that participants require for their desired activities, but also to provide them in a form and at a time that they can be used to maximum advantage.

(6) The participant's opportunity for informal social contacts with Americans. For many visitors, informal social contacts, which permit some degree of personal interaction, are a major source of satisfaction. Some of our respondents indicated that, while they enjoyed the more formal occasions organized for the group as a whole, these did not completely satisfy all of their social needs. In the light of this experience, it would seem to be important to supplement the more formal gatherings with other types of experiences that allow for informal interactions. One way of meeting this need would be to encourage staff members, such as the leaders of the academic seminars, to spend more time in informal contacts with the participants, to be present at some of the meals, or to invite the participants to their homes. Another way of meeting this need would be to arrange informal gatherings at the university, to which members of the community--from different walks of life--are invited. Small gatherings in private homes also can be arranged, to which several participants along with several members of the community are invited. At such gatherings, individual participants would be able to strike up acquaintances with individual Americans. This, in turn, is likely to lead to subsequent contacts and to spontaneous invitations to American homes.

While there is a special value in spontaneous invitations, we found that even the organized private hospitality seems to be highly successful. The participants reacted very favorably to their experiences of private hospitality, both during their period at the university and during their travel period. These were often mentioned as highlights of their visit. Participants saw these invitations to private homes as opportunities to meet Americans as individuals, in the context of their families, and in an informal and relaxing atmosphere. They enjoyed the personalized nature of the relationship, the conversations that it engendered, and the chance to participate in the regular activities of an American family. They were impressed by the generosity, frankness, openness, and the amount of interest in the outside world shown by their American hosts. Experiences of this sort can be quite unpleasant, if the encounters turn out to be patronizing, ritualistic, and impersonal. In our interviews, however, we had practically no indication of any negative reactions to these experiences. We would recommend that arrangements for private hospitality continue to be included in future exchange programs, both during the period at the university and during the travel period. Of course, in the selection and orientation of families participating in these arrangements, one must pay deliberate attention to the possible ways in which private hospitality might backfire. In arranging an itinerary for the travel period, it may be a good idea to encourage those participants who are likely to find it difficult to make their own social arrangements to visit, other things being equal, communities that are smaller and less inundated with foreign visitors. In such communities, they are more likely to receive individualized attention.

The opportunity for informal social contacts with Americans is likely to be a major factor in determining the visitor's general reaction to the experience as a whole. Formation of personal relationships to nationals of the host country often represents the most warmly remembered aspect of a trip abroad. Not only does it provide the visitor with satisfying experiences while he is in the foreign country, but it may also lead to the establishment of lasting personal ties.

(7) Enhancement of the participant's national and personal status. The question of whether one is being accorded the status one is due is likely to arise in the minds of participants in any group situation. It is, however, particularly likely to come up in a multi-national situation. Here, national status tends to be tied in with personal status. Participants may become sensitive about the status accorded their own national group. Such sensitivities have often been noted among representatives from African and Asian nations who may feel (sometimes with justification) that Americans and Europeans are under-valuing their countries and are patronizing them. The reverse reaction has also been noted. Some Europeans may feel that they are taken for granted while representatives from developing countries are given more attention. Asian participants, in particular, may experience a feeling of status deprivation. They may feel that they are neither assigned equal status to the extent of the Europeans, nor given the special attention that is accorded to the Africans.

A participant's satisfaction with his experience as a whole is likely to depend, to a large extent, on the degree to which it helps to enhance his status and thus, also, his self-esteem. The recommendations that we have already made for increasing the participants' opportunities for colleague-type relationships with their American counterparts and their opportunities to make personal contributions to the program are clearly designed to provide status enhancement. A participant's sense of personal, as well as national status is likely to increase when he finds that others regard his professional contributions of interest to them, or when he is asked to report about his own work and about the activities in his country. Our respondents also appreciated the fact that very prominent people came to speak to them at the university or arranged social gatherings for them at their homes. One can assume that they found this satisfying, at least in part, because it contributed to their sense of status enhancement. Private invitations to American homes, in general, can serve to enhance the participant's status--provided, of course, that the American hosts are genuinely interested in the visitor and not patronizing toward him.

Of at least equal importance is the other side of the coin. In organizing an exchange program, one must be actively concerned with avoiding experiences that represent status deprivation. There are various points at which status deprivation can be experienced, of which people planning exchange programs should be constantly aware: (a) It is possible for the professional staff of an exchange program to define the role of the participant in such a way that it would lower his status. This would happen, for example, if he is personally treated as a student, or as a representative from a backward country. This kind of definition can too easily be built into the structure of a seminar and produce a patronizing attitude on the part of the staff. Fortunately, this type of definition of the participants' role was completely absent in the Seminar under study. The participants were clearly treated as high-status professionals, which probably helps to account for their generally high level of satisfaction with the experience. (b) There are also various ways in which the administrative staff, both at the university and in the field, can inadvertently contribute to experiences of status deprivation. Thus, differential treatment of the participants by the administrative staff, particularly where this can be interpreted in terms of nationality, may have this effect, and may produce resentment. Similarly, when a participant does not receive individualized treatment--when arrangements for him are made entirely in the context of arrangements for the group as a whole--he may feel that he has not been accorded the attention that his status warrants. (c) We have already mentioned that in their social and professional contacts outside the Seminar _per se_ participants may experience status deprivation, if they are ignored, or if they are treated in a patronizing way. We find no indication that this happened to our respondents to any noticeable degree, which probably helps to account for their high satisfaction with their experiences of private hospitality and the travel period in general. (d) Finally, status deprivation can be experienced in the course of contacts with officials and service personnel unconnected with the Seminar. For example, participants may be subjected to bureaucratic indignities or to racial prejudice. The organizers of the Seminar are, of course, unable to control completely the occurrence of such experiences. What they can do, however, is to anticipate the possibility that participants may be faced with such situations, prepare them for these, give them some explanation of the relevant context, and provide them with information that will help them deal with the situations when they do arise.

Creating the conditions for a truly satisfying exchange experience requires careful planning and coordination, attention to many details, and probably considerable expense. There is every reason to believe, however, that these are investments worth making. International exchanges have an enormous potential for enriching the professional lives of the participants; for developing fuller, more refined, and more differentiated views of other nations; and for establishing networks of professional communication and exchange that cut across national boundaries. The more satisfying the experience as the person participates in it, the greater the likelihood that its long-range potential will be realized.

## Impact of the Seminar on Participants' Views and Activities

The importance of providing an experience that will be satisfying to its participants certainly requires no justification. It is an end in itself, both from the point of view of the responsibility that the organizers of exchange activities have toward those whom they invite to participate in these activities, and from the point of view of maintaining a positive relationship between organizers and participants, in the short run as well as in the long run. We have gone beyond these obvious desiderata, however, and suggest, in the preceding paragraphs, that the more satisfying an exchange experience is for those who participate in it, the more likely it is to have a significant, and positive impact on them--on their professional activities and attitudes, on their views of other nations, and on their involvement in international networks of professional communication and exchange. Granting the relationship between satisfaction and impact, it is of course possible that an experience that has been satisfying in many respects has failed to produce significant effects in certain areas, or that an experience that was unsatisfactory in many ways has nonetheless had an important impact on many of the participants. Moreover, there are many instances in which short-run discomfort may be necessary if long-run effects are to take place. For example, new learning may require the often painful re-examination of preconceived ideas; insight into a foreign culture may require an immersion into it that is sufficiently intense to carry with it certain risks of "culture shock" and personal misunderstanding.

We would assume that the relationship between satisfaction and impact is often of a very subtle and detailed nature--that certain kinds of satisfaction are most likely to facilitate certain kinds of impact, and, furthermore, that the apparent effects of certain experiences may be quite different when they are observed in the short run than they are when observed in the long run. Our data are not sufficiently refined to give as much information about these more subtle relationships, although they do offer some relevant hints (especially the data reported in Chapters 12 and 13) to which we shall return below. For the moment, however, we want to ask a far grosser question. We have seen that the Seminar under study was, on the whole, a very satisfying experience for those who participated in it, although certainly many participants had some criticisms of it--and some participants had many criticisms. Do we have any evidence that this satisfying experience had an impact on the participants?

The most striking finding of impact concerns the participants' images of America and American broadcasting, and specifically the degree of complexity and differentiation of these images. The data that are most directly relevant to this point come from the before- and after-questionnaires. Scores on an over-all index of change in degree of differentiation of the image of America and American broadcasting were computed for each participant and each member of the comparison group, on the basis of their questionnaire responses. When the scores of participants are compared to those of their controls, a very clear finding emerges: Participants show an increase in differentiation, while comparison group members actually show a slight decrease. The difference between the two groups is statistically significant, and suggests very strongly that the participants in the Seminar did indeed develop more complex and differentiated images of America and of American broadcasting as a result of their American experience. Their responses on the after-questionnaire tend to become more concrete and specific; they evidence an awareness of a greater number of aspects of American society and of differences within it, a better understanding of American institutions in their own terms, and a picture that is generally more detailed and elaborate.

Thus, we are justified in concluding that the Seminar participants' experience in America did produce measurable changes in their attitudes toward American broadcasting and America in general on what we would regard as the most crucial dimension: the complexity and differentiation of their images. Changes on these cognitive dimensions, we submit, are far more important than a global increase in favorableness might be. Such changes in over-all favorableness are often based on incomplete understanding and are likely to be quite ephemeral. The increased complexity and differentiation that we found in our data is particularly significant in view of the fact that we were dealing with respondents who were quite sophisticated and already relatively knowledgeable about America and American broadcasting. Thus, it seems reasonable to generalize these findings to other exchange experiences and to conclude that such experiences are indeed capable of producing significant changes on the cognitive dimensions of attitudes toward the host country and some of its institutions.

While this is our major finding, it does not represent the only impact of the experience that we have been able to identify. Let us look, first, at some of the other effects of the trip on participants' images of America. The images they hold, after the completion of the sojourn, vary greatly, although certain common themes emerge again and again. Some of these are positive in tone, some negative, and some cannot really be placed on a favorable-unfavorable dimension. On the whole, the participants' view of America and of Americans is clearly more positive than it is negative, but it is by no means wholly uncritical. The point that comes up most frequently and most emphatically is the participants' awareness of the complexity and diversity of America--which is, of course, in keeping with our evidence that their images of America have indeed become more differentiated.

When we compare the responses of participants and controls, a year after the Seminar's completion, we find several differences between them. Aside from the participants' greater tendency to stress the complexity and diversity of America, they are also more likely to dwell on certain of the human qualities of Americans, on the importance of socio-economic differences within American society, and on the commitment of Americans to democratic values. These are features of America whose full implications, it would seem, can only be understood through first-hand contact. Questionnaire responses also reveal a change on the evaluative dimension, though not as marked a change as that found on the dimension of differentiation: All the information from the questionnaire that relates to respondents' general images of America and Americans suggests that the Seminar participants (relative to the comparison group) become more favorable in their evaluations as a result of their experience in America. This does not imply, of course, that they have no criticisms of American life, but simply that, by and large, they tend to see it in a more positive light.

What about participants' images of American broadcasting? They seem to be impressed with the potential for high quality programming in the United States and with some of the products that have been achieved, but they feel that the structure of broadcasting is not set up so as to maximize this potential. They are critical of the limited allocation of resources for such high quality programming relative to more strictly commercial pursuits. They see commercial considerations as a major source of the problem, although they can also point to certain advantages of private ownership of broadcasting media, particularly within the context of American society. The differences in broadcasting structure and the low quality of some of the American products limit, in their view, the applicability of American approaches to their own countries, but some of the creative ideas--particularly in educational and public affairs broadcasting--clearly seem of value to them. Certain features of American broadcasting--such as the extensive use of commercials and the low repute of radio--should, they feel, be systematically avoided. In fact, in these areas it would be best for American broadcasters to learn from their counterparts abroad.

When we compare the questionnaire responses of participants with those of their controls, we find two changes in their evaluation of American broadcasting which, though small, are consistent with the composite image we have just presented. On the one hand, participants tend to become somewhat less satisfied with American broadcasting--particularly with its coverage of information about their own countries, which is of course a matter of personal significance to them. On the other hand, they tend to become somewhat more inclined (relative to the comparison group) to see American broadcasting as a potential source of valuable contributions to their own broadcasting systems. It seems reasonable to suggest that increased familiarity with American broadcasting may lead to a tendency to become both more critical of certain aspects of it, and more aware of specific approaches and procedures that can fruitfully be applied to one's own situation. This finding also suggests that it would be a mistake to treat "favorableness" as a unitary dimension.

As far as participants' attitudes toward American broadcasters, as individuals, are concerned, many seem to have developed a sense of colleagueship and of identity in interests and values with them. They have generally high regard for them, and certainly evaluate them more favorably than unfavorably. They do have criticisms, particularly about the way in which American broadcasters meet their responsibilities toward their audiences. They tend to ascribe the shortcomings of their American colleagues in this area to the conditions under which they work which, in turn, they see as related to the structure of American broadcasting. Their descriptions of American broadcasters actually do not differ markedly from those given by comparison group members, but what differences do emerge reflect the participants' greater familiarity with American colleagues--with their strengths, as well as their weaknesses.

So far, we have been speaking about the impact of the sojourn on the participants' views of what they found in America--of American society and its members, of American broadcasting and its practitioners. There is also some evidence of the personal and professional impact that the sojourn had on the participants.

In their own evaluations of the significance that the experience had for them, large proportions of the participants indicate that they succeeded, during their American sojourn, in learning many things that they had hoped to learn when they first arrived. First and foremost, they gained professional knowledge and insight, which are relevant to their professional activities at home. In addition, they acquired new knowledge about American broadcasting and about American society--which was, indeed, an important part of the agenda that many participants brought with them. An impact of a different sort is the sense of enjoyment that they derived from traveling throughout the United States and interacting with Americans--a part of the experience that is even more highly valued in retrospect, when one reflects on the trip and speaks about it, than it is while the trip is in progress. Many participants also report that their American sojourn produced some change in their perspectives of their own countries; and in their orientations toward international exchanges and their involvement in international contacts. All of these reports suggest that, at least subjectively and at least in small ways, many participants have become different people as a consequence of their trip. For different participants the impact, no doubt, has been in different areas. For some the trip may have been responsible, in part, for a reorganization of their professional ideas and plans, with substantial consequences for their careers. For others, its significance may rest largely in the warm memories and the tidbits of new knowledge that it has produced. In all of these cases, however, we are dealing with effects that the person carried with him at the end of the sojourn and that, in some sense, make themselves felt in his life back home.

Comparisons between participants and controls yield further information about the professional impact of the experience. Many participants reported, in the post-return interview, changes in their positions or responsibilities--but so did many controls. One difference between the two groups, however, is that the participants are more likely to ascribe these changes to the recognition of their own abilities. One might speculate that the experience abroad has enhanced their self-confidence and sense of professional competence. Further evidence along these lines can be found in the questionnaires. Between the first and the second questionnaires, participants tend to become more positive in their orientation toward their own professional future. Unlike the controls, they show some increase in their level of aspiration, i.e., in the professional position they hope to achieve and the scope and quality of the operation they hope to oversee. At the same time, they show an increase in the congruity of hopes and aspirations: they tend not only to increase in their level of aspiration, but also in their confidence that they will be able to achieve this level.

As for their views about broadcasting in general, participants were more likely to say--in the post-return interview--that they had undergone some changes. There is only little evidence, however, about the specific nature of changes manifested by the participants (more so than by the controls); one point that does emerge is their renewed or increased commitment to the importance of radio. There is some indication, in the questionnaire data, that the participants do indeed reorganize their views about broadcasting--at home as well as in the United States--to a somewhat greater extent than the controls. They also reveal a tendency on the part of participants to display an interesting change with evaluative implications: they come to perceive fewer areas in which broadcasters in other countries can benefit from their own experiences. This change probably reflects an increased awareness of the relative advantages and disadvantages of their own broadcasting procedures and approaches as compared to those of other countries. In general, this does not make the Seminar participants dissatisfied with their own procedures, but it does seem to make them less certain of the applicability of these procedures to the situations that prevail in other countries.

There is also some evidence that the reverse effect occurs--that participants become less certain of the applicability of procedures used in other countries to their own professional situations. Participants tend to express greater reservations than controls about the training value of international exchanges for their own broadcasters. These reservations seem to be based precisely on the feeling that adaptation of the procedures used in one country to the conditions of another country is often a difficult and hazardous task. This does not mean that participants come to reject the value of international exchanges. As a matter of fact, according to their own reports, they have become more positive about such exchanges as a result of their experience. What has apparently happened, however, is that they have become more realistic about the potential contributions of such exchanges. They find exchange valuable, but have also become aware of its limitations and thus tend to assign to it a more modest role than do the controls.

As for international communication, many participants seem to have established and maintained a considerable number of contacts with American individuals and organizations. A much smaller number, however, have maintained their contacts with fellow-participants. One wonders whether this very limited success in building continuing connections among the participants is related to the limited place that professional exchange among the participants themselves had in the over-all design of the Seminar.

In sum, we can conclude that the present Seminar had a major impact on participants' views of America and American broadcasting--and one that is likely to be lasting because it involves not merely a change in the favorableness of images held, but a change in their complexity, differentiation, and richness of detail. The Seminar's impact on the participants' professional attitudes and activities was less marked, but there certainly is some evidence of changes in these respects. The Seminar seemed to be least effective in generating an international network of professional communication and exchange, although it produced a stepped-up level of interaction of the participants with American individuals and organizations.

These findings suggest the kinds of changes that an international exchange experience of the type that we have investigated are capable of producing in some of the participants. This does not mean, of course, that such changes will occur in every program of this type and certainly not in every individual participant in such a program. It is obvious that in the present study, too, not every participant was affected to the same degree and in the same way. Let us turn, therefore, to some conclusions about the differential reactions manifested by different subgroups within the Seminar, and some of the possible implications of such differences.

## Subgroup Differences in Satisfaction and Impact

We used two different approaches to divide our population into subgroups, in order to be able to explore possible differences in reaction within the total group. One involved comparison between two subgroups differing in terms of demonstrated impact. We used, for this purpose, our index of change in degree of differentiation of the image of America and American broadcasting, which is the measure that yielded our major finding of impact. The comparison, then, is between those who showed the greatest amount of change on this index and those who showed the least--in other words, between High and Low Differentiators (Chapter 12). Our second approach involved comparison between two subgroups differing in certain defining characteristics that are likely to have a bearing on their reactions to the situation and its impact upon them. For this purpose, we divided our population into Europeans and Non-Europeans and made comparisons between these two groups (Chapter 13).

When we compare High and Low Differentiators, we find that the former are more likely to have come to the American experience with considerable self-confidence about their professional competence and their ability to make the contacts and gain the information they wanted--a self-confidence bolstered by their linguisitic and cultural proximity to the host society. In line with this self-confidence, they had great expectations for a satisfactory and useful experience. They were greatly disappointed, however, in the professional part of this experience, particularly during the first phase of the sojourn, spent at the university. Their satisfaction seemed to rise again as they tended to turn away from an emphasis on professional pursuits to an emphasis on other aspects of the experience, including the opportunity to learn about American society. These and other findings suggest three factors that may, in interaction with each other account for the increased differentiation manifested by this subgroup of participants: (1) Their readiness, --due to their freedom from cultural and linguisitic barriers, their professional self-confidence, and the specificity of their expectations--to enter quickly and easily into searching, give-and-take interactions with the Americans they met, and thus to become exposed to the variety and complexity of Americans and their views; (2) their possession of a fairly well articulated cognitive framework about the United States, which helped them scan new information more quickly and integrate new insight more readily; and (3) their disappointment in the professional experience, which may have caused them to give greater weight to the interest in learning about America that they brought with them, but that might--under other circumstances--have remained more latent.

It is interesting and instructive that this subgroup, which shows the greatest amount of change on one important dimension, includes individuals who were rather disappointed in one important part of their experience in America. The disappointment may or may not be causally related to the changes manifested by the High Differentiators, but in any event it did not interfere with these changes. This does not mean, of course, that such disappointments would never interfere with meaningful change. There is good reason to assume that the interest in learning about America was at least a latent part of the agenda of the High Differentiators, so that they were able to turn to it with some enthusiasm. Thus, they were both ready and interested in engaging in the kinds of interactions that would allow them to develop a more differentiated image of America and, from all indications, the interactions they did engage in were satisfying to them. For some individuals, disappointment in the professional domain may have had rather devastating effects. This group, however, given their dispositions and interests, was able to look for their satisfactions in other directions and, fortunately, was able to find them.

Turning to the comparison between Europeans and non-Europeans, we find two rather distinct patterns in their approaches to the American experience. The European tended to come to the Seminar with a broader and less specific agenda, which included not only professional concerns, but also an interest in seeing the country, in meeting people, and in deepening his understanding of American society. He quickly decided that the Seminar was not set up and the participants were not selected in such a way as to make it a professional exchange at the level he desired, and therefore he readily adopted the role of observer. He was interested in and enjoyed everything he could hear and observe about America, both during the university phase of the Seminar and during the travel period. On the professional side, too, he enjoyed visiting broadcasting facilities, observing their activities, meeting American broadcasters and comparing notes with them. The non-Europeans, by contrast, came with a more limited and specific agenda. He was concerned with increasing his professional skills and learning about broadcasting procedures that could be applied to his home situation. He was highly task-oriented during both phases of the Seminar. He found the professional exchanges at the university useful and would, in fact, have liked a greater emphasis on them. During the travel period, too, he was interested in experiences that were directly relevant from a professional point of view. In short, he was not only less interested in learning about America in general (except as an incidental, if highly valued part of his experience), but also less interested in observing and hearing about American broadcasting. What he wanted were professional experiences around specific problems that would maximize his directly applicable skills and knowledge.

In line with their different expectations, goals, and ways of relating themselves to their American experience, the Europeans and non-Europeans manifested rather different effects. The European did not expect the American visit to have much of an impact on his professional activities and he reports that it did not, with one major exception: He wanted to establish professional and personal contacts with American colleagues, and he clearly succeeded in doing that, more so than the non-European. The most striking effect of the trip is the increased understanding of American society and differentiation of his image of America with which he comes away--quite in keeping with the agenda that he had set for himself. On the whole his image of America is positive. His attitude toward American broadcasting is also differentiated, but on the whole less positive. He praises certain of its specific approaches and techniques, while raising questions about its over-all structure and emphasis.

The non-European comes away with a highly favorable attitude toward American broadcasting. He approves of it in rather global terms, which probably reflects the fact that he is less interested in making comparisons between the American and other approaches as he is in extracting from American broadcasting things that would be useful in his own situation. The major impact of the experience, for the non-European--again, consistent with his particular agenda--was in the professional area. He seems to feel that participation in the Seminar helped, at least in some measure, to enhance his skills, to increase his knowledge of relevant approaches and techniques, to redefine his professional role, and to advance his career.

Needless to say, this portrait of the European and non-European does not apply to every representative of these groups even within our population, and it would certainly be a mistake to assume that the orientations that we have outlined are descriptive of Europeans and non-Europeans in general. What is important about these portraits is not so much what they tell us about Europeans and non-Europeans, but what they tell us about two different patterns of reaction to an international exchange experience of the kind that we have investigated. Different participants in such experiences bring to them different goals and expectations, different needs and agenda. The specific requirements of an experience that will be satisfying and useful for one may be quite different from the requirements for the other. These considerations underline the importance of careful matching of participants and programs: given a particular group of participants, we must ask whether the program that has been devised for them is indeed the one they need and want; given a particular program, we must ask whether the individuals selected as participants in it are indeed the ones who will find it most satisfying and beneficial. Such matching can, of course, not be done blindly. It would be a step backward if we were to conclude, on the basis of our analysis, that Europeans need one kind of experience and non-Europeans another. Our analysis suggests that European vs. non-European in this context is an important variable, but we must keep in mind that (a) it is only one of many variables, and (b) it is a variable that itself consists of many variables--i.e., that it reflects a number of factors that need not always go together. Our hope, then, is that the two patterns we have identified will be considered in the matching of participants and programs, but on an individual rather than on a group basis--that they will help organizers of exchange programs assess whether the fit between a given program and a given individual is right, in view of the needs and expectations of that individual.

There is another important qualification that needs to be made here and that our analysis seems to support. It would be a mistake to assume that a particular program can serve only one purpose and should therefore be restricted to one type of participant. Our comparison between Europeans and non-Europeans demonstrates that, despite their different orientations, both of these groups were able to derive some degree of satisfaction and benefit from the same Seminar. While the Seminar did not fully meet the special needs of either type of participant, it seemed to meet them sufficiently to make the experience, on the whole, a satisfying and meaningful one for each, and to produce an impact that still manifested itself a year later. Clearly, the same program can have different meanings and uses for different participants--there are different ways in which it can be successful.

The same point is suggested by our analysis of the High Differentiators, who seem to have made their sojourn a satisfying and meaningful one, despite the disappointment they experienced, by turning into a different direction. There is often, in other words, more than a single path available to the individual that can make the experience worthwhile for him. This is not to say, however, that whatever one does will work out satisfactorily. There may well be times when the disappointment is of such a nature that it cannot be compensated for, or when the program may be of such a nature that it cannot offer compensation through alternative paths.

There may well be times when the needs of different individuals and subgroups are so different that it is not productive to include them within the same program. At other times, the needs may be such that they can be met effectively within the same program, as long as it provides a sufficient number of alternatives for them. It is our impression, for example, that the different subgroups within the present Seminar would have had an even more satisfying and useful experience if it had been made easier for each of them--within the context of the over-all program--to spend at least part of their time in different activities, suited to their special needs. Such an arrangement, where feasible, would be in keeping with the two major general implications that can be drawn from our subgroup analysis: (1) that different individuals, in keeping with their different goals and orientations, need different kinds of experiences if an exchange program is to be satisfying to them and have an impact upon them; and (2) that there is more than one way in which a program can provide satisfaction and have impact, so that the same program can be satisfying and effective for different individuals, in different ways, despite differences in their goals and orientations, as long as it offers avenues for meeting their special needs.

# Appendix A

## QUESTIONNAIRE FOR SPECIALISTS IN BROADCASTING

1. Below is a list of activities in which television might be engaged. To what extent are these activities involved in television (as it is practiced or planned) in your country? For each item, please check whether it represents (or will represent) a major activity, a minor activity, or one which is hardly ever engaged in.

| | Major activity | Minor activity | Hardly ever done |
|---|---|---|---|
| a) Providing specific information, such as news, to the public | | | |
| b) Providing education to the public | | | |
| c) Providing popular entertainment | | | |
| d) Providing high-level entertainment for those groups within the population that are interested | | | |
| e) Giving the general public contact with good literature, art, and music | | | |
| f) Contributing to the improvement of artistic and literary taste | | | |
| g) Providing programs of interest to special groups within the population, such as religious, ethnic, or occupational groups | | | |
| h) Providing a forum for political discussion | | | |
| i) Communicating the goals of the government to the citizens of the country | | | |
| j) Selling products and services | | | |
| k) Creating common ties in the country | | | |
| l) Contributing to the creation and maintenance of national loyalty | | | |
| m) Providing information about other countries | | | |

Which of the above activities do you think should receive more emphasis by television in your country (as it is practiced or planned) than they do now? Please list them by letter below:

Which of the above activities do you think should receive less emphasis by television in your country (as it is practiced or planned) than they do now? Please list them by letter below:

2. The list of activities in which television might be engaged is repeated below. This time, consider the extent to which these activities are involved in television in the United States. For each item, please check whether it represents a major activity, a minor activity, or one which is hardly ever engaged in.

| | Major activity | Minor activity | Hardly ever done |
|---|---|---|---|
| a) Providing specific information, such as news, to the public | | | |
| b) Providing education to the public | | | |
| c) Providing popular entertainment | | | |
| d) Providing high-level entertainment for those groups within the population that are interested | | | |
| e) Giving the general public contact with good literature, art, and music | | | |
| f) Contributing to the improvement of artistic and literary taste | | | |
| g) Providing programs of interest to special groups within the population, such as religious, ethnic, or occupational groups | | | |
| h) Providing a forum for political discussion | | | |
| i) Communicating the goals of the government to the citizens of the country | | | |
| j) Selling products and services | | | |
| k) Creating common ties in the country | | | |
| l) Contributing to the creation and maintenance of national loyalty | | | |
| m) Providing information about other countries | | | |

Which of the above activities do you think should receive more emphasis by American television than they do now? Please list them by letter below:

Which of the above activities do you think should receive less emphasis by American television than they do now? Please list them by letter below:

3. It may be helpful to broadcasting specialists in other countries to learn about the experiences that your country has had in this field. Can you mention some of the experiences in your country that may be particularly instructive to broadcasters in other countries?

4. Similarly, it may be helpful to broadcasting specialists in your country to learn about the experiences that the United States has had in this field. Can you mention some of the experiences in the United States that may be particularly instructive to broadcasters in your country? (This may include experiences that you would want to adapt to your own situation, as well as experiences that you would want to avoid.)

5. How similar should the functions of television in your country be to the functions of television in the United States? Please check the item below that seems most descriptive of your position.

_______ Very similar

_______ Similar, but different in some respects

_______ Different, but similar in some respects

_______ Very different

6. In what ways (if any) should the functions of television be different in your country from the United States?

7. Specialists in mass communications in the United States are, at present, engaged in a critical examination of the state of television in their country. Because of their direct involvement in the situation, they may have some difficulty in seeing all of the problems. From your position of greater distance, what would you say are the most important problems facing American television today?

a) First problem:

What do you think is the major cause of this problem?

Can you suggest any measures that might alleviate this problem?

b) Second problem:

What do you think is the major cause of this problem?

Can you suggest any measures that might alleviate this problem?

c) Third problem:

What do you think is the major cause of this problem?

Can you suggest any measures that might alleviate this problem?

Other problems:

8. Although to a certain extent television faces the same problems in every country, situations do arise that are unique to a particular country. What are some of the major problems that television (or the development of television) faces in your country?

   a) First problem:

      What do you think is the major cause of this problem?

      Can you suggest any measures that might alleviate this problem?

   b) Second problem:

      What do you think is the major cause of this problem?

      Can you suggest any measures that might alleviate this problem?

   c) Third problem:

      What do you think is the major cause of this problem?

      Can you suggest any measures that might alleviate this problem?

   Other problems:

9. By what means do you think Americans obtain information about your country?

10. Do you think American mass media provide adequate information about your country?

| a) How extensive is the coverage? | b) How accurate is the coverage? |
|---|---|
| _____ Very extensive | _____ Very accurate |
| _____ Quite extensive | _____ Quite accurate |
| _____ Fairly extensive | _____ Fairly accurate |
| _____ Not too extensive | _____ Not too accurate |
| _____ Not extensive at all | _____ Not accurate at all |

11. What impressions of your country do you think Americans have? That is, if a typical American were asked to describe your country, what characteristics would he be likely to mention?

12. Can you think of any groups of Americans whose impressions of your country differ from the ones you just described?

    Group:

       In what ways do their impressions differ?

    Group:

       In what ways do their impressions differ?

    Group:

       In what ways do their impressions differ?

13. If an American television network were planning a feature program about your country, what would you recommend that they include in order to help the American public gain a better understanding of your country?

14. By what means do most people in your country obtain information about the United States?

15. a) Do you think the mass media in your country provide adequate information about the United States?

_______ Very adequate

_______ Quite adequate

_______ Fairly adequate

_______ Not too adequate

b) In what ways do you think the coverage might be extended? For example, what information might be included in a feature program about the United States?

16. How important is each of the following in your kind of job? For each item, please check whether it is very important, somewhat important, slightly important or not important in your kind of job.

| | Very important | Somewhat important | Slightly important | Not important |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| a) Administration and management | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| b) The engineering and technical side of communications | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| c) Public relations (interpreting your organization to the public) | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| d) Collaboration with others within and outside your organization | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| e) The artistic side of communications | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| f) Research | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| g) Contact with developments in the field of education | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| h) Contact with the government of your own country | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| i) The commercial side of communication | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| j) Contact with international developments in communications | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |

Please describe the specific activities involved in your job:

17. a) In general, how satisfied are you with your work?

_____ Very satisfied
_____ Satisfied
_____ More satisfied than dissatisfied
_____ More dissatisfied than satisfied
_____ Dissatisfied
_____ Very dissatisfied

b) Which aspects of your work provide you with the greatest satisfaction?

c) In contrast, which aspects of your work cause you the most dissatisfaction?

18. If there were no obstacles in your path, what would you hope to be doing in five years? Please be as optimistic as you can in your description.

19. Now, taking into account the circumstances that are likely to prevail, describe what you expect to be doing in five years.

20. If people working in broadcasting were asked to name the professions that were most similar to their own, they might name the following ones:

advertising executive
artist
businessman
civil servant
electrical engineer
film producer
newspaper editor
politician
teacher
theatrical director
university professor
writer

a) In general, which one of the professions listed above do you consider to be:

Most similar to your own? ____________________
Next most similar? ____________________
Least similar? ____________________

b) Taking only the social status of the professions into consideration, which one would you say is:

Most similar to your own? ____________________
Next most similar? ____________________
Least similar? ____________________

c) Now consider only the skills required for your work. Which of professions is:

Most similar to your own? ____________________
Next most similar? ____________________
Least similar? ____________________

d) Finally, consider the activities involved in your work and name the profession:

Most similar to your own? ____________________
Next most similar? ____________________
Least similar? ____________________

RIC Clearinghouse
JUN 11 1968
n Adult Education